

JPRS-UKO-85-006

3 April 1985

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 18, December 1984

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

3 April 1985

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 18, December 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Some Current Problems of CPSU Theory, Strategy and Tactics (K. U. Chernenko)	1
To the Participants in the All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on "The Perfection of Developed Socialism and the Party's Ideological Work in the Light of the Decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum (K. U. Chernenko)	24
Shevardnadze Views Problems of Youth Education (E. Shevardnadze)	26
Work Systematically and Strenuously (N. Slyun'kov)	42
Material and Technical Foundation of the Agroindustrial Complex (Yu. Konkin)	56
Developed Specialism and the Formation of Contemporary Economic Thinking (A. Abalkin)	69
From Liberation to Socialist Renaissance: Revolutions of the Forties in Eastern Europe (I. Orlik)	82
Who Is Preventing Peace in Africa? (Ye. Tarabrin)	96

Year 1984. The Most Important Trends in International Developments (Yu. Molchanov, V. Nekrasov)	110
On the History of the Creation of the Main Marxist Work (V. Kulikov, A. Pokrytan)	129
Important Contribution to the Study of the World Historical Process ...	135
International Conflicts and Universal Security in the Nuclear Century (V. Petrovskiy)	142
Short Book Review (A. Golubev)	149
Bookshelf	151
Index of Articles and Materials Published in KOMMUNIST in 1984	153

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 18
December 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : December 1984

Signed to press : 17 December 1984

Copies : 970,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1985

SOME CURRENT PROBLEMS OF CPSU THEORY, STRATEGY AND TACTICS

LD221658 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84)
pp 3-21

[Article by K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] It is one of the traditions of our Leninist party to give, at every major historical watershed, a brief yet capacious theoretical formula expressing the essential nature of the new stage we are entering upon, and the specific features of the new tasks; and to propose political slogans which enable us to combine the latest conclusions of revolutionary theory with the practical activity of the masses--the ideas and will of the party with the thoughts and will of the millions.

Today, our country stands at the beginning of the stage of developed socialism and the entry into this is the logical result of the intense creative activity of the party and people--the outcome of the labor of decades, of which we are justly proud. At the same time, it is also the beginning of a great and complex turn toward resolving the tasks of perfecting the socialism that has been built in our country.

It is the political, ideological-theoretical, and methodological approach to the fundamental questions of the further development of socialism and progress toward communism expressed in that deep formula that has formed the basis of work on the new edition of the CPSU program which is to be discussed and adopted at the next, 27th Party Congress. The plans for the economic and social development of the country in the 12th Five-Year Plan and in the longer term will also be coordinated with the program's guidelines.

As it prepares for the congress, the party deems it necessary to give a comprehensive account of the meaning of the path we have traveled, and a precise scientific assessment of how things stand at the present time; to bring to the awareness of every communist and every Soviet person the full novelty and complexity of the tasks arising from this; and to awaken the need to solve them creatively.

The foundation of the strategy and tactics of the CPSU in present-day conditions is provided by the Marxist-Leninist concept of developed socialism as a special and objectively necessary stage of the first phase of communist socioeconomic formation. Resulting as it does from a profound analysis of the experience of our party and of the other fraternal parties, and of world realities, it represents an outstanding contribution to the theory of scientific communism.

Methodologically speaking, the heart of the concept of developed socialism, its "living soul," is dialectical materialism--the doctrine of development. It is the point of view of development that provides that key to understanding that concept, not as a collection of theses to be learned by rote, but as the system of views that is constantly being creatively enriched, an instrument for knowing and transforming socialist reality. That is the gist of the matter.

It was the doctrine of development that enabled Marx and Engels to elaborate a scientific understanding of human history, to see in it an objective and naturally ordered process, each new stage of which does not arrive until the necessary material and spiritual prerequisites have come to fruition. The idea of development forms the basis of the conclusion of Marx and Engels regarding the necessity for a socialist transformation of society, and of their doctrine of the two phases of a single communist formation. Lenin, too, proceeded from this in elaborating his theory of socialist revolution, of the transitional period, and of the logical ascent of socialism up the rungs of its socioeconomic maturity.

And today it is precisely from these positions, having generalized all that is in essence new in science and practice over recent decades, that the party has proposed a whole complex of ideas which enriched the contemporary theory of socialism. As I have already had occasion to remark, the main conclusion is that before resolving the tasks directly related to the building of communism, IT IS NECESSARY TO PASS THROUGH THE HISTORICALLY LENGTHY STAGE OF THE DEVELOPED SOCIALISM.

This conclusion is of fundamental importance to us both in the theoretical and political context. First, it makes it possible to give a scientifically based definition, with no suggestion of Utopia, of the level of socioeconomic maturity achieved by our society, and of the distinctive nature of the moment in time which we are experiencing; second, to define more precisely ideas about the content and duration of the socialist phase, and about the essential prerequisites for the transition to communism; third, to creatively renew on this basis the strategy and tactics of the CPSU, taking account of both the immediate future and the long-term communist perspective, to formulate specific tasks and mobilize the masses to carry them out.

It is exceptionally important that this conclusion point us toward a realistic appraisal of both our great achievements and our existing shortcomings, an appraisal which neither exaggerates nor makes light of one or the other. Such an appraisal also commits us to appropriate practical action.

The strength of our theory lies in its veracity in accordance with the objective progress of events. This also applies in full measure to the methodology adopted for use by communists, which Lenin with good reason defined as the "revolutionary dialectic of Marxist realism..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 11, p 137). To regard reality in all its tangible variety, its multifaceted and contradictory nature, in constant motion and development from the lowest to the highest--this is the principal precept of the dialectic, which lends particular perspicacity to both theory and politics. And we see that the reality of a society which entered the stage of developed socialism is a contradictory combination of major, truly historic successes in the building of socialism and general communist principles which have taken firm root in our life on the one hand, and on the other, of unresolved tasks of the present day, as well as problems inherited from yesterday, problems which in principle could have been resolved earlier, at the foregoing stages of our development.

Our country has advanced a long way within the framework of the first phase of communism. We have demonstrated in practice that the path of socialism is the path of truly radical resolution of contradictions which for centuries have been a source of constant social convulsions and shocks.

Soviet society today is a system which has established itself on socialist social relations--economically, politically and ideologically binding together the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, the people's intelligentsia and all the nationalities and ethnic groups of the country. The creation of such a system of relations opens broad opportunities, as was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, to complete the reconstruction of all spheres of the life of society on the collectivist principles inherent in socialism.

Entering the stage of developed socialism is a great achievement for the Soviet people. It does not, however, signify that all socialist principles and norms are now being observed in all areas of our life, in every, so to speak, cell of the social organism, fully, consistently and unswervingly. As is known, we have not yet achieved that. Not all our problems and tasks have been resolved on the level of the demands of developed socialism. Here lies the common root of the multifarious problems toward which the thinking of the party and its Central Committee are turned today.

Indeed, take, for instance, the sphere of the economy. Its present shape is increasingly determined by associations and enterprises fitted with advanced equipment and technology and notable for rational organization, high labor productivity and high economic efficiency of production. These are the areas of our national economy about which it may be said that, as a whole, they measure up to the requirements of developed socialism. They are the real shoots out of which the future will grow and which must multiply and grow stronger alongside the development of the scientific-technical revolution and scientific-production and agroindustrial integration, and alongside the dissemination of front-ranking experience throughout the national economic system.

At the same time, we have quite a number of enterprises which operate with already outdated equipment and employ yesterday's technology. There are also enterprises where there is a preponderance of manual, low-skilled labor, which, as is known, millions of people in our country still perform. And that means that here, to use the language of dialectics, the material-technical and organizational sides of production are in a certain state of contradiction with its socialist socioeconomic nature, contradiction by public ownership.

This is a real contradiction of the period we are living through, and to resolve it means bringing lagging sectors up to the level of the frontrankers, particularly such sectors of the economy as agriculture, construction, transport and consumer services; raising the efficiency of the national economy as a whole; and achieving a decisive breakthrough in the intensification of all its sectors. This was the task set by the party at the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums.

There are also certain differences in the level of socialist maturity and the degree to which socialism's high norms are realized and its vast potentialities utilized in some other areas of our life. It is, after all, no secret that examples of a conscientious attitude to labor and socialist property still coexist in our country with lack of discipline, bad management and a desire by some people to secure their own prosperity at the expense of others and society by turning to their own advantage shortages of individual consumer goods and inadequacies in the system of supervision of the measure of labor and consumption. All this requires a serious improvement in the economic mechanism, perfecting distributive relations, further strengthening good order and discipline and stepping up the effectiveness of ideological education work.

There are also difficult problems in the social sphere engendered by differences in the specific interests of different classes and groups of the population and by the necessity of harmonizing them in the best possible way. They also exist in the political sphere, where, as was noted at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we have to surmount a certain discrepancy between the great wealth of possibilities of our democracy, and above all, the soviets, and its real practical utilization. They also exist in the sphere of the relations between nationalities, since the resolution of the nationalities question in the form in which we inherited it from capitalism signifies neither that it has been entirely removed from the agenda, nor that we have already succeeded in getting rid of the remnants of the past in people's psychology or of manifestations of narrow local interest or national narrow-mindedness.

IT IS THE TACKLING OF THE WHOLE SET OF GREAT AND COMPLEX PROBLEMS RELATING BY ORIGIN AND CHARACTER TO VARIOUS LEVELS IN THE FIRST PHASE OF COMMUNISM THAT CONSTITUTES THE SUBJECT OF MULTIFACETED WORK WHICH THE PARTY DEFINES AS PERFECTING THE SOCIALISM WHICH HAS BEEN BUILT IN OUR COUNTRY. Evidently, some things will have to be not just completed but redone. Lenin did not rule out this possibility, pointing out that "we shall more than once have to finish things off, redo them, and start afresh" (op. cit., vol 44, p 224).

Reviewing today the road we have traveled and putting forward ideas which are innovative in their essence, we again and again turn to Lenin's inexhaustible legacy, finding in it layers of thought which give a creative spur to a deeper understanding of the past, present and future.

Reflecting in one of his last works on the distinctive features of our revolution, Lenin came to the conclusion that "for all the conformity with the general laws of development throughout world history, individual periods of development constituting peculiarities in the form of order of this development, modifications of the ordinary historical order, are not in the least ruled out, but, quite the reverse, are presupposed" (op. cit., vol 45, pp 379, 381). By "ordinary order" he meant the achievement of such a level of development of productive forces and culture as is required for the creation of socialism. As Lenin noted, this level did not exist in the full sense in the old Russia. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution immediately made our country the most advanced one politically. According to Lenin's ideas the changes in the historical order consisted in the fact that the workers and peasants first of all gained power in order subsequently, on this basis, to overcome material and technical backwardness and to raise the country's productive forces to the highest world standards. Some of our present problems and difficulties are directly and historically connected with the fact that, as yet, not all of the tasks engendered by these alterations in the normal order have been totally resolved. Their complete resolution will open up broad prospects for the revelation of the advantages of socialism in all spheres of social life and for the gradual transition to communism.

The perfecting of our society, of course, presupposes that today we must work better than yesterday, and tomorrow better than today. But by itself this is not enough. It does not just amount to "celebrating" the entry into the stage of developed socialism. It is more important to determine the very nature of the demands that are made by the new conditions, the specific guiding lines and aims precisely coordinated with the realities of the stage which has been achieved and calculated primarily for the foreseeable future.

As a result of all of our preceding development, in the course of the vast creative work of the party and people to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums, we have reached such positions when we are able to and should MOVE FORWARD, TAKING AS OUR GUIDELINES THE LOFTIEST AND MOST DEMANDING CONCEPTS ABOUT SOCIALISM ELABORATED BY SCIENTIFIC THEORY. Herein lies the essence of the deep qualitative changes which have matured in all spheres of the life of our society.

What then are the main guidelines by which we should lay our general course to perfect our socialist society? In posing the question in this way we distinctly acknowledge that one can talk of deepening and making more specific our concepts only within the limits of firmly established facts and fully formed tendencies. Acting in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist behests, without any attempts at speculative construction of detailed forecasts, in recent years the party has enriched its theoretical and political arsenal with tenets allowing a clearer view of the general line of development and allowing the path to the future to be laid more precisely.

The party's efforts are directed primarily to completing the intensification of the country's economy on the basis of a considerable acceleration of scientific-technical progress and of the all-around perfection and improvement of the forms and methods of socialist economic management. It is only in this way that the most advanced material and technical base can be created which accords with the strict standards of developed socialism and that, consequently, the qualitatively new standard of welfare of the Soviet people can be ensured.

We shall in every way promote the deepening of the processes leading to the establishment of a classless socialist society, and the further flourishing and drawing together of the nationalities, and seek to ensure that social relations everywhere be built in strict accordance with the principle of social justice inherent in socialism.

Our main guideline in developing the political system is achieving the full socialist self-management of the people. We understand this as a democratic system of managing the affairs of society and of the state, operating in Lenin's words, not only for the working people, but through the working people. Naturally, this will demand a further growth of the role of the party and a qualitative rise in the level of the party-political running of society.

It is impossible to reach high targets in economic and sociopolitical development without relying on the profound knowledge, high awareness and culture of the working people. At the same time, in the creation of new production, economic, social and political conditions, must, in the final analysis, be directed toward ensuring the harmonious development of the individual. The all-around development of the personality has been and remains our highest aim. In this it is necessary only to remember that the degree of all-around development of each individual is determined by the degree of all-around development of all. This depends on the level achieved of socioeconomic maturity of society and its material and cultural opportunities.

The assimilation by all the working people of the truly innovative and profoundly creative conclusions and decisions of the party signifies in essence a reorientation of social awareness. The importance of the ideological-theoretical and propaganda work aimed at this is exceptionally great. In the development of the awareness of people, in linking the latest ideas of the scientific theory of socialism with the social creativity of the people, we are fully justified in seeing, as we have always done, the huge advantage of our system, a mighty source of the labor and social activity of the masses. For this reason it is absolutely vital to form in every Soviet person a clear understanding of the scale and complexity of the tasks arising, and a readiness and the skill to fulfill them, working energetically, with initiative and with maximum effect.

At the same time, it must be constantly borne in mind that it is not merely a question of theoretically, so to speak, assimilating new ideas. It is vitally important to arrange matters so that all the work of the party, the administrative and economic organs and the public organizations is structured

With these ideas taken into consideration, everywhere and at all levels. In this lies the political meaning of the recent decisions on the fundamental questions of economic development of the CPSU Central Committee and the government. From the same viewpoint the party Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo have approached the pressing problems of the work of the soviets, the trade unions, the Komsomol, the people's control and the creative unions.

From the foregoing it is clear that the perfection of developed socialism will comprise a whole historical epoch. This epoch will have its own specific stages, its own sequence of tasks, and its own time scale. But it is essential to resolve urgent, top-priority problems today, immediately, laying down general, qualitative guidelines for the plans for the next 5-year period.

All this will be reflected in the new edition of the CPSU Program. Making such amendments to it as are dictated by the spirit of political and scientific realism which has become established in the party, by the same token we define more precisely the prospect of reaching the frontiers of the actual building of communism. "Strictly distinguishing the stages, which are by nature different, and soberly studying the conditions in which they proceed," wrote Lenin, "is by no means to postpone the ultimate aim indefinitely, by no means to slow one's progress prematurely" (op. cit., vol 9, p 131). We take this Leninist methodological principle fully into account.

The founders of our doctrine saw communism not only as an ideal and as some sort of final state, but above all as "real movement..." (See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 3, p 34). The perfecting of developed socialism is actually that real progress toward communism. There is no other way to attain it.

All haste, all running ahead, engendered by facile notions of that path, means, if we think about it, nothing else but the attempt to put off until tomorrow what can and must be done today. That is not Lenin's way, not the bolshevik way. After all, what most often lies behind the political blather that Lenin condemned is the intention, albeit from the best of motives, to count our present deficiencies and omissions as belonging to the natural accompaniments of socialism, of which we can rid ourselves only under full communism. That approach lowers the level of what we expect both of socialism and of communism, and blurs what Lenin called the vast difference between them.

So what we are talking about is not a slowing down of our progress toward communism, but an acceleration; yet, it is a real, actual acceleration in which we set ourselves realistic objectives and employ real means to achieve them.

We have all we need to cope effectively with the new tasks. And, above all, we have behind us "the advantage of the theses of a party that has a firm knowledge of where it is going..." (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 34, p 244).

When we point out that the process of perfecting advanced socialism is a multifaceted process, we are thereby drawing attention to the colossal amount of work that lies ahead of us. It would obviously be absurd to set an exact date for its completion: The time scale here will be laid down by the results of the labor activity of the Soviet people. It will be determined, to a decisive degree, by what targets have been attained, and what heights scaled, in the national economy.

Neither should it be forgotten that we are going to have to live and work in a world that is full of difficulties and contradictions. The economy demands prime attention in this connection also. In it is the material foundation of our defense might and of all our efforts directed toward providing for the security and peaceful working conditions of the Soviet people. The better the results of our economic activity at home, the more substantial will be the contribution we can make to economic cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, and the more fruitful that cooperation will be for ourselves, for our allies and for world socialism as a whole.

In general, in elaborating what you might call our global foreign-policy strategy, we are guided, and must be guided, by the thought that it is by our economic successes that we exert our main influence upon international development and the course of world history. In a word, economic construction is our "main policy" (Lenin).

The state of affairs in our economy, its achievements, problems and difficulties, all this will, of course, be the subject of detailed discussion at the 27th Party Congress. The congress will sum up the results of the country's economic progress in the period under review, draw up the balance of what has been done and of what we have failed to complete; it will set the tasks of the development of the national economy in the following 5-year period and through the end of the century. And here, many economic questions, including major ones of fundamental importance, will, on this occasion, be on the agenda of the congress, not only because time has brought us to the milestone in the calendar that divides one five-year plan from another.

OUR ECONOMY ITSELF HAS COME RIGHT UP TO THE FRONTIER AT WHICH QUALITATIVE CHANGES AND TRANSFORMATIONS IN IT HAVE BECOME AN IMPERATIVE NECESSITY, AS IT IS CALLED. Consequently, party preparations for the congress include preparations for making profound analysis both of the essence of the changes which have come to a head in the national economy and of the imminent and long-term prospects which they have opened up.

Today, the whole form of our thoughts and actions connected with the economy should be determined by the concept of developed socialism and should correspond to the demands included in it for realism. What does this mean?

It is extremely important to have a realistic approach to the question of what can and cannot be provided by the economy within the framework of the first phase of communist formation. It is impermissible to orient it toward unattainable even if attractive aims. For such a departure from Marxist-

Leninist science and from life or, in other words, for such voluntarism retribution is inevitable. But it is also impermissible to go to the other extreme, that is to underestimate in any way the possibilities of the socialist economy and to set it tasks on the basis of lowered conceptions of its creative strength. This is also an unsuitable position unworthy of Marxist-Leninists and alien to the very revolutionary spirit of the socialist society.

In our economic affairs there should be no place for a narrow overemphasis on practical matters which shuts itself in on daily current concerns and fears great ideas and aims, for it is no secret that, at times, the attention of certain comrades working in the national economy is totally absorbed by immediate, private problems. It is doubly bad when the attempt is made to justify an approach to the economy, an approach suffering from a lack of broad and bold views by referring to a misconceived demand for realism. One must not close one's eyes to the difficulties and complications, they say, and today we have so many, they say, that it would be better not to draw great plans for tomorrow. It is pertinent to recall how Lenin reacted to such "realism," if one can call it that: "...When great plans appear which are calculated for a period of many years there are frequently skeptics who say: What is the point of calculating for many years ahead? For heaven's sake let us do what is needed now...It is necessary to know how to combine both. It is not possible to work without a plan calculated for a long period and for important successes" (op. cit., vol 42, pp 153-154).

Such a precisely Leninist approach to matters should serve as a model of genuine realism in economic work. Temperance in essentially economic calculations is organically combined with broad political vision, with the ability to generalize and express the main things which shape both the current reality and the future of the Soviet economy.

From this it follows that our plans and economic practice should be given not simply an economic foundation but primarily a political economic one. In other words, they should be based on the knowledge and all-around use of the objective laws of the development of the socialist economy. For, if one does not take them into account one cannot talk of realism.

The documents of the party congresses and Central Committee plenums contain the conclusion that at the stage of developed socialism it becomes an objective social demand to make the transition to intensive methods of economic management and to a sharp raising of the efficiency of production. It is precisely the political-economic essence of this conclusion which is important. If it remains not understood then, as experience shows, the theoretically deep and true idea to a great extent loses its mobilizing and guiding significance for practice.

Indeed, what is it that urges us toward production intensification? Or, in other words, toward seeking to obtain a greater yield of output with a smaller expenditure of material resources and with a smaller number of workers? One reply which is correct in its own way, but which is still inadequate and is lacking in political-economic depth, states that in recent times we have been

made more aware of the limited nature of material and human resources that can be brought into production.

Yes, there is something of a shortage of resources, but let us ask ourselves: If, on the contrary, raw materials, fuel and other materials and workers existed in any required amounts, would it be permissible now to manage the economy using the methods, wasteful according to modern notions, which are characteristic of an extensive economy? Incidentally, this is by no means an abstract question. We have not had and do not have now a shortage of many types of resources. Nevertheless, it is inadmissible today to use them without keeping the strictest tally of their utilization and without the active manifestation at every step of a concern for husbanding them.

It is inadmissible because the very successes of the Soviet economy have imposed a limit on its extensive development. The need for intensification is dictated not merely, and even not so much, by a shortage of resources, but above all by the fact that our national economy has already achieved a level of production at which, in order to make headway, it is necessary not so much to expand it as to renew it. When organizing and channeling the national economic process, one must not, under any circumstances, be guided by the objective of "producing the same things, but merely in greater quantity."

Of course, we still have a shortage of some types of output. For some time to come, a large amount of our efforts and resources will continue to be directed at the elimination of all sorts of shortages and disproportions, at the opening up of bottlenecks. There is nothing you can do about this. But it is important to realize that while taking measures to resolve these problems as rapidly as possible, it is essential to shift most of one's attention to the attainment of a qualitative change for the better in the whole national economy. One must be able to see clearly that the country's further economic progress depends to a decisive degree on how all available resources are utilized and on our ability to put into play the enormous creative forces which are inherent in the very nature of the economy of developed socialism.

These forces are such that today they enable us, or, to be precise, they even oblige us, to set ourselves a major task of programmatic significance: that of ensuring that the country attains the highest world level of social labor productivity. The advancement of this task is well founded politically, socially and economically.

First, since we are striving to bring all aspects of the life of Soviet society fully into line with the highest scientific notions of socialism, the issue of labor productivity assumes the same fundamental significance as was attached to it by Lenin. It was, as one knows, the attainment of the highest labor productivity that he regarded as the most important and fundamental factor for the final and complete triumph of the new economic and social structure. And by its significance and content, the process of perfecting developed socialism presupposes that this task which Lenin formulated must be transferred to the plane of practical implementation.

Second, if the further development of our society is seen as a movement toward the full realization of the socialist ideal, then this very fact imposes an

obligatory social guideline for this development--raising the prosperity of the people to the highest level. This can only be achieved on the basis of raising labor productivity. Its highest level is, in a socialist society, both a necessary and sufficient condition for ensuring a similar level for the standard of living of the working people.

Third, the course toward achieving first place in the world in the sphere of labor productivity corresponds to our present economic opportunities. The unified multisectorial national-economic complex which has been established in the USSR possesses a mighty production-technology potential. In output of many types of product our country is confidently in the lead and has no equal in the world. Where the productivity of public-sector labor is directly concerned, in its rate of growth the Soviet Union is ahead of the leading capitalist states; although there is still a gap--a considerable one--between the Soviet economy and highly developed capitalism in this key indicator, it is within our power to overcome it and break into the lead.

It would be incorrect to hope that we shall be able to cover the whole distance remaining between us and this goal rapidly, but, great and complex though the task may be, there are no grounds whatever for postponing its completion beyond the bounds of the foreseeable future. For this reason it should remain in our minds and literally stand before our eyes even today. Our plans and specific economic decisions must accord with it.

The immediate tasks of the Soviet economy should also be considered from the same standpoint. The point at present is that before the end of the 1980s it is vital that we achieve a fundamental upturn in raising the efficiency of the national economy, in the intensification of all branches of it. The objective prerequisites for such a watershed are present. All our economic work must now be directed decisively toward implementing it.

The first and most obvious thing which must be done is to mobilize the organizational efforts and material means essential for the swiftest possible technical reequipping of all branches of the national economy, and for the rapid production assimilation of the most progressive technologies. This is a task of key importance. To resolve it is to resolve the problem of intensification, of raising the efficiency of the economy as well. It is natural that questions of economic and production exploitation of the immense scientific-technical potential of our country, questions of its further development and buildup, are now at the focus of attention of the party. It is planned that they will be given all-around, detailed consideration at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The result we wish to obtain from work to introduce the latest equipment and technology into production is correctly defined as a qualitative transformation of PRODUCTIVE forces. At the same time, there exists the truth well known to all Marxists: that the DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES inevitably has a definite social aspect, molded by production relations. We never forget this truth, and we must not forget it, particularly since life and our own experience give constant reminders of it.

They give positive reminders, so to speak, when the new economic forms introduced within the framework of economic experiments immediately and tangibly promote a renewal of the production apparatus and a substantial upsurge in labor productivity. They also give negative reminders in cases where forms and methods of management which have become established and have justified themselves in the past become obstacles in the way of new equipment, keeping it out of the workshop. This points to only one conclusion: The level of all our concerns over the qualitative transformation of productive forces depends directly upon whether we are able to introduce the appropriate changes in production relations.

The initiatives that the party has come out with and the measures that it has taken in order to give development to the process of perfecting production relations are familiar: They include the active dissemination of the brigade contract method; the organizing of agroindustrial complexes; increasing use of cost accounting; and those major innovations, though as yet tentative, that are destined to establish firmly at all levels of economic and production activity two inseparably interconnected elements, GREATER INDEPENDENCE AND GREATER RESPONSIBILITY. The extraordinary importance of this work is, on the whole, determined by the fact that it is calculated to create the economic conditions without which the orientation toward the technical reequipping of the national economy, and toward its intensification, could, to put it bluntly, hang in midair.

Highly productive technology, multiplied by universal economic interest in its application, is really the only thing that can make the imminent economic breakthrough into a reality, uniting the two revolutions--the scientific-technical and the social--and revealing with new force the advantages of socialist organization of production. The chief of those advantages as Lenin taught, is that socialism opens up to the toiling masses "the possibility of working FOR THEMSELVES, using all the advances of the latest technology and culture" (op. cit., vol 35, p 196).

The history of our country shows what great and unparalleled labor achievements a people is capable of when it is conscious of working for its own benefit, in its own interests. It is of special importance to us now to strengthen and develop that awareness. Why now, especially? Because the intensification of production is simply impossible without an interested, enterprising and creative attitude to the task at hand on the part of every worker, literally at every workplace. And here we cannot rely merely upon a general understanding that with us, all work serves to increase the public wealth, and ultimately enhances the prosperity of all the working people. We must be thorough in seeing to it that all socially useful work is more directly and tangibly felt by those who perform it as work that they are doing for themselves.

The question of making the workers more interested in their own work is one of perfecting our system of material and moral incentives, and of distributive relations generally.

The task that is being put in the forefront here is that of making sure that wages are strictly dependent on the results of labor, its productivity and

conditions. We cannot allow wage increases to get ahead of the increase of labor productivity, yet this is something that regrettably still occurs and, as has been repeatedly noted in party documents, has a negative effect on the economy and the prosperity of the people. But we also incur appreciable losses from a practice that is the opposite of this: That is, when people achieve clearly better results in their economic activity, but receive no substantial reward for it. Who can count how many workers have had their ardor dampened, how much labor enthusiasm has been extinguished and what losses has our national economy suffered as a result?

A great deal has recently been done to increase the stimulating effort of the organization of labor and the forms of payment. Considerable experience has been amassed in this respect in the frontranking financially autonomous brigades and at many of the enterprises working in the conditions of the economic experiment. Measures are being taken which make it possible to forge a closer link between work and payment, not only in industry and agriculture, but also in the service sphere and in management. On the whole, however, it has to be admitted that, though we are moving in the right direction, we are moving too slowly. It would seem that in some of our departments, there is insufficient awareness as yet of what practical conclusions should be drawn, in present conditions, from Lenin's behest that "distribution is a method, a tool, a means of increasing production" (op. cit., vol 43, p 359).

In interpreting the experience of decades of socialist construction, the party drew, at the 26th Congress, the exceedingly important conclusion that the interconnection between the economic and social progress of the country must be intensified. The same idea is expressed in our now oft-repeated formula that in order to live better, we must work better. These are simple words and their meaning is clear to everyone, and yet it does no harm to take a more detailed look at what they signify and what obligations they entail. Above all, of course, the point is that good work, better work, should yield earning benefits, and, conversely, anyone who works badly must be prepared to accept not a better life, and not even the same life as before, but a worse life. We are trying to ensure that everyone is fully accountable for his work. After all, it cannot ultimately be tolerated that people should be paid for defective products, for making goods which they themselves, in the role of shoppers, would spurn. That is one point.

Secondly, what does "live better" mean? This idea is at times interpreted in a very one-sided manner, which makes it entirely a question of getting more pay and a higher income and achieving a higher level of consumption. Undeniably, the material side of the question is very important and it is inadmissible to neglect it to any extent, but surely that is not the sum total of people's lives, particularly in our socialist state? There are, in fact, a myriad of spiritual, moral and psychological values which Soviet people cherish no less, if not more, than material benefits. Has your job become more interesting, has the respect in which you are held in the collective grown, is there a good, comradely atmosphere at your enterprise? Those are just a few factors chosen at random which, taken together add up to something of what it means to "live better." And to this, of course, one can and must add the myriad other successes, achievements and joys, which everyone strives

for in their personal lives and which we are all working toward together in the larger, common life of our society.

The fundamental rule, however, still remains in force: To live better in this broad sense as well, it is necessary to work better. And that is not just because the only source of the material means for a better life is the sphere of labor and production, but also, and this is the main point, because in this sphere the creative activity of Soviet people unfolds every day, their personal qualities are disclosed and tested and their social interests and norms of conduct shaped. The nature of their relations in factory workshops, stock-farms, and institutions and their attitudes to each other and to the work at hand, which are formed here, are what ultimately determines the whole make-up and quality of our lives.

If you think about it, this gives rise to a converse and no less true formula: To work better, you must live better. Indeed, when, for instance, in a production collective, life is going well, when an atmosphere of friendship and mutual support reigns, the work also goes well.

The same thing happens on the scale of society as a whole. We note with satisfaction that in recent years things have gone better in our national economy. It has proved possible to surmount a number of negative tendencies which arose at an earlier period. Everyone knows that measures adopted on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee with the aim of introducing good order, raising the level of organization, and strengthening discipline in production at all levels of management and, in general, in all areas of our life and activity, have helped to achieve this. This has produced a tangible positive effect in itself, but, in addition the fact that the people's mood was raised has also had a part to play. The Soviet people immediately reached the proper conclusion that more order means a better life, and this has inspired them to fresh labor efforts and better work, the results of which enable us today to rely on the successful conclusion to the five-year plan period.

Nor should one omit to mention the great significance in this context of the struggle we have mounted against misappropriators of public wealth, bribe-takers and speculators. It would seem that there is no direct connection between these decisive measures adopted by party and state bodies and improvements in the production indicators in the economy. But such a connection exists, and it is quite tangible. For when society is able graphically to express not in words but in actions its irreconcilability toward incomes not derived from labor, at the same time it stimulates socially and encourages morally conscientious labor.

It is here, indeed, that the issue of social justice inherent in our society arises; in our country the exploitation of man by man has been eliminated. All members of society have been ensured in real terms an identical relationship toward the means of production. All, irrespective of sex and the nationality to which they belong, have been given equal rights to labor, recreation, housing, to free medical services and education, to provision in old age. The social policy of the party and state is constantly directed toward raising the level of the people's well-being, toward strengthening the health of all Soviet people, toward extending the housing stock, and toward

developing and further improving the systems of general and vocational education. All this guarantees a high degree of equality which is achievable only under conditions of socialism.

However, this is only one side of our social justice. There is another one, too, which is expressed precisely in the basic principle of socialism--from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor. And to the extent that we are striving to raise the whole of our life up to the level of the highest requirements of socialism, to that extent we are obliged to ensure that this principle is applied in practice in the most consistent way. No one in our country casts doubt nor can cast doubt upon the fact that payment and the distribution of wealth according to one's labor is the most just of causes. Conversely, if departures from this take place, if the notorious practice of leveling-off flourishes, then this naturally disturbs the conscience and is taken as injustice.

In this connection, it should be stressed particularly that a system for providing material incentives for labor which has been set up correctly provides benefits not just in the production sense; it also exerts a beneficial moral influence upon the labor collectives, upon society, that is to say, if one looks at the essence of the matter, upon the person. And this is very important, for in our country, to use the words of Marx, "...the person is the end-purpose of production..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part I, p 476). The requirements and the interests of the working person serve as the social landmark of our economic progress and social progress as a whole.

Among other things, this presupposes that the consistent implementation of the basic principle of socialism refers not just to its second part ("to each according to his labor"). Constant concern must be shown to ensure that the working people have the opportunities to reveal and apply their abilities. This, too, is a requirement of socialist justice.

The main and essentially inexhaustible reserve for the acceleration of the country's economic development that is now necessary lies in people who work in an interested and purposeful way. And it is quite natural that over the past few years, when the volume of our party's economic work has increased and when its content has been enriched, attention in this work to what one is accustomed to call the human factor of production has grown substantially.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that, for the party, being engaged with the economy means first and foremost getting engaged with the people who run the economy. POLITICAL METHODS FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: THAT, IN ESSENCE, IS THE FORMULA FOR THE PARTY LEADERSHIP OF THE ECONOMY. The June 1983 Central Committee plenum contributed a great deal for the understanding of this piece of truth. Having examined matters pertaining to the ideological and mass political activity of the party, it adopted decisions which were important also from the point of view of the economy in so far as the fundamental aim is to set in motion the big creative forces embedded in the consciousness and ideological conviction of the masses.

The Soviet people inseparably link up the successes achieved by our people in the revolutionary struggle and in socialist creation with Lenin's party. It has earned its leading position in society through its selfless struggle for the ideals of scientific socialism, for the interests of the working class and of all working people. And it has been recognized by the people itself as being the vanguard force of society.

The whole practice of world socialism convincingly proves that the creation and successful functioning of a new social system is possible only under THE GUIDING ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. At every fresh historical stage--this is also borne out by the experience of the work that has already been done on perfecting developed socialism--the leading role of the party increases. This is an objective law.

The thesis that it is necessary to narrow down the sphere of party leadership is zealously inflated in the camp of the "improvers" of socialism, of whom there have been more than enough at all times among the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and revisionists. It is suggested that either the economy or issues pertaining to social or political development be excluded from this sphere.

From the fundamental point of view, attempts to restrict the range of the party's guiding influence in whatever sphere are untenable if only for the reason that the interests of the working class and all working people, which the party expresses, cannot be reduced either to purely economic or purely social or ideological ones. They permeate the whole of public life and the party, it stands to reason, cannot ignore this. The need to embrace with party influence all facets of the life of society increases even more at the stage when socialism, entering the period of its maturity, acquires the characteristics of an integral system and the correlation and interdependence of economic, sociopolitical and spiritual factors becomes tighter than ever before.

Our party sees the way to increasing the effectiveness of leading society not in the narrowing down of its sphere, but in improving its methods. These are methods of influencing politically the development of the economy, social relations, democracy and culture, and methods of convincing, organizing and educating the masses. It is through the formulation of key directions for economic and social policy, through the organization of the monitoring of its implementation, and through the cadres and communists active at all levels of socialist construction, that the party exercises its leading role.

Our political system has been, and remains, a tried and tested mechanism by which the party and the Soviet people are welded into a single whole. The party has a vital interest in ensuring that it gives wide expression to the interests of all classes and social groups of our society, opens up still greater scope for independent activity and initiative by the people and works toward the lofty aim of seeing that everyone plays a direct part in running the affairs of the state and of society.

Socialism realizes its advantages through democracy. The increasing of the party's leading role and the deepening of socialist democracy are a single, integral, natural process. The party will continue to conduct a broad quest for new and still more effective means of implementing the power of the people, and will go on striving to ensure that better use is made of those forms of it that have been tested in practice. Today, the center of gravity of this work is being transferred onto the full and consistent realization of the extensive rights with which the soviets, labor collectives and all levels of our democratic system have been endowed.

Thus, and only thus, can we embrace the whole spectrum of tasks confronting society, take into account the particularity of the interests of all classes and strata of the population, and place on a better footing the system of the party's vital ties with the masses.

A task of prime importance today is improving the work of every link in the political system and cleansing it of bureaucratic, parochial and departmental accretions which slow down the initiative of the masses. It is not less important to achieve both a more precise democratization of the functions of the soviets, trade unions, Komsomol and other public organizations, and closer interaction among them under the guidance of the party. Here a kind of law of economy of resources must operate also, to enable us to obtain with the minimum of expenditure the greatest and most lasting results.

A matter that merits special discussion is the work of the state apparatus and the improvement of the organs of administration. This question has been raised more than once and quite a lot has been done. But, by and large, progress so far has been slow, and not least because some comrades are taking a simplistic view and trying, for instance, to solve the problem of reducing the size of the apparatus mechanically, while leaving the existing structure of administration unchanged. This approach does not, and cannot, produce the desired effect. Staffs reduced in this way quickly return to normal, or even grow.

Reduction of the apparatus must be the result of painstaking work on its rationalization. What is involved is the elimination of superfluous levels which give rise to bureaucratic red tape, and the improvement of the organization of managerial work and the provision of better technical facilities for it. What seems to be needed is a concept on the basis of which one can work out the optimal structure for each organ of administration. It may even be that, to achieve this, some new levels may have to be set up; but the general outcome must necessarily be reduction.

However good the apparatus, each manager must constantly seek out meetings and direct contacts with the mass of the party, the working people. As we know, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee do systematically hold such meetings, and they are very productive. Our system of party information also works, on the whole, quite well, enabling us to pick up sensitively the mood of the people and study their opinions and suggestions.

At the same time, in a number of cases, local party organs, and the leaders of departments and institutions, either do not have sufficient information about negative phenomena, or simply shrug it off, and do not take the necessary measures to bring about a healthier situation. This has happened in Uzbekistan, Rostov Oblast and Krasnodar Kray. In these places, as you know, it has been necessary to take strong action to put matters right, and not, unfortunately, on the initiative of the local party organizations. There, the barometer of public opinion long ago moved out of the "fair" mark.

A reliable path in the strengthening of the leading role of the party is the consistent observance of Leninist norms and principles, of the Leninist style in the work of party committees, state and economic organs and of the public organizations. They have been tested by decades of struggle and creation, and remain the most important guidelines in perfecting our work. It is hardly necessary to say that the universal introduction of these principles is possible precisely because they express the character of the party and the nature of our system and socialist state.

Of course, an example must be set here by the party and above all by its organization of intraparty work, by the maturity of intraparty relations and by the very style of party leadership. Broad discussion of party decisions, fundamental criticism and self-criticism, openness in the work of all the ruling organs of the party, energetic participation by the entire party mass in drafting and discussion of policy, and strict discipline in implementing the decisions adopted--such are the distinguishing features of the intraparty life of the CPSU.

Of leading importance to us communists is, of course, the well-tried principles of democratic centralism. In the CPSU it is recognized by all, and there is no need to prove its enduring significance. The Central Committee devotes constant attention, on the one hand, to developing and deepening democratism in our party at all levels, and on the other, to strengthening centralism, good organization, and unity in the implementation of the decisions adopted. Belittling either of these two interlinked principles of democratism or centralism is fraught with serious error.

In the year of the coming party congress it is exceptionally important to study attentively all that is new and interesting which has appeared recently in the work of the party organizations, without, of course, leaving shortcomings unexposed. We may note with satisfaction that in the work of a number of republican party committees, kraykoms and obkoms a creative strand has begun to show itself increasingly clearly. An experiment on a broad front in various sectors of management of the economy science and culture, is being carried out by the central committees of the communist parties of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia and Lithuania, and by the Moscow Obkom, Krasnoyarsk Kraykom and Sverdlovsk Obkom. Broad preliminary discussion in primary party organizations of major problems being submitted at plenums and party committee bureaus, and at party congresses and conferences, are becoming the rule.

Recently, the CPSU Central Committee approved the experience of the Leningrad Obkom, which drafted a territorial sectorial program for intensification of the economy on the basis of speeding up the introduction into the national

economy of the achievements of science and technology. Apart from anything else, the value of this experience lies in the fact that it suggests one of the ways of managing socioeconomic processes at the territorial level, where many unresolved questions still remain.

Of course, no two initiatives are the same. The Central Committee will continue to do all it can to encourage the initiative of local party committees in the resolution of problems related to the rational utilization of labor, raw material and power resources, and in meeting the needs of the population for consumer goods and domestic services. But at times one thing puts one on one's guard: One sometimes sees how the energy of some managers is devoted to a considerable extent to the construction of prestige rather than useful projects and these are being built on the basis of so-called noncentralized sources of finance. But in actual fact it turns out that resources are being diverted from plan objectives: The periods for the assimilation of capital investments are dragged out and the state bears the direct loss. We will fight resolutely against "initiatives" of that kind.

Persistently improving the style of their activity, the party committees are called upon to exert an active influence upon the style of the work of state and economic organs, too; to exert an influence, first and foremost, through organizing their own work in an exemplary way and through stricter exactingness.

It is essential to harden particularly the price demanded for slackness and violations of executive discipline. Without the strictest discipline the most wonderful decisions and intentions will remain no more than good desires. At the same time, discipline, as we understand it, is certainly not some kind of opposite to democracy. On the contrary, it makes it possible to realize in practice the interests of the majority and the will of the party and the people. Without discipline and a firm social order democracy remains merely a fine phrase, but of course discipline must not fetter initiative. The struggle for a precise organization of the matter at hand must not become transformed into overorganization.

At the 27th Congress we are to discuss the issue of changes in the CPSU Bylaws. The Bylaws are the law of the party's life: Figuratively speaking, they are our party constitution. And the proposals being received from party organizations and the experience of the communist parties of the fraternal socialist countries must be studied with complete attention. In a word, work must be done on the Bylaws in a thoughtful and creative way. This, without doubt, will serve the further consolidation of the democratic foundations of the party, the strengthening of a discipline that is strict and common for all communists, the growth of their activity and initiative, and the further improvement of intraparty relations.

Nor is the accountability and elections campaign very far away. In this connection, I think, it is pertinent to raise once again the issue of the character of our meetings and conferences.

An atmosphere of creative search, of efficiency, of adherence to principle, of a self-critical approach to the evaluation of one's own work must reign at meetings. For this communists must take up arms resolutely against formalism.

For example, we are accustomed to calling the discussion of accountability reports and decisions a debate. But do the content and tone of the discussion always correspond to the true meaning of the word? Reports frequently merely set out impassively absolutely incontrovertible truisms, alternating with figures, together with, let us be frank, a large portion of glorification addressed to the higher leadership. Is it surprising when communists respond to this not with criticism and self-criticism, not with a businesslike discussion of the problems, but with standard approvals and cheerless accounts of one's own performance. But freedom of discussion and criticism, one of the essential norms of party, presupposes the comparison of different views on a concrete issue. It is precisely this kind of approach that encourages a lively and fruitful discussion of topical problems.

In antiquity they used to say that if different views were not expressed, how could the best be then chosen? Real, and not ostentatious, unanimity is achieved, as a rule, after a question has been pondered deeply and interpreted collectively from all sides. In a word, we are in favor of comradely discussions and arguments, but arguments, of course, that are sensible and businesslike, and which are crowned in sensible suggestions.

Formalism is a tenacious, many-sided creature, and one of its manifestations is the generation of paper. The impression is created that some establishments evaluate their work not according to the actual state of affairs in the sector within their jurisdiction, but according to the number of resolutions, decisions and instructions of all kinds that have been issued. Nor have methods of leadership by means of large numbers of commissions and conferences, each involving large numbers of people, which merely consume time, been excluded everywhere. How can one fail here to recall the observation of Lenin upon the poem by Mayakovskiy about those who have spent too long in conference: "It is enough to take a look at us, how we sit in meetings and work in committees, to say that THE OLD OBLOMOV HAS REMAINED AND IT IS NECESSARY TO WASH, CLEAN, PULL ABOUT AND THRASH HIM FOR A LONG TIME TO MAKE ANY KIND OF SENSE" (op. cit., vol 45, p 13).

Policy is conducted through people. This Leninist tenet is of fundamental importance for the work of the party with cadres. The extent to which labor collectives and all links of the country's national economic complex work in a precise, coordinated and intense manner depends on cadres, and above all on party cadres. The party considers cadre policy to be an effective instrument for exerting active influence on the development of all spheres of Soviet society and an important factor of its progress.

However, life does not stand still. It presents new demands. Now, when the need has become ripe for profound qualitative changes in all spheres of society the problem of cadres has acquired a particular resonance. This is why the Central Committee raises the question not simply of improving work with cadres, but of CADRE POLICY AT THE PRESENT STAGE. This means that

changes in keeping with modern conditions in the whole system of selecting, training and promoting cadres and checks on their activity are necessary.

Naturally, the point is not that some sort of special campaign be carried out or that there be a "shake-up" of cadres. What is needed is calm and thoughtful work aimed at the future. At the same time in cadre policy there are quite a few, to put it bluntly, sore matters which require not talk but urgent practical resolution. It is necessary to wage even more resolutely the struggle against all kinds of abuse of official positions, against manifestations of protectionism and forming regional cliques. And here the Central Committee will not tolerate any indulgences, for this matter is a political one, a matter of the prestige of the party and trust of the masses.

The main thing, it stands to reason, is not the harshness of punishments, although the Central Committee--and this is well-known--takes severe measures when necessary. The main thing is to create an atmosphere in which the slightest deviation from the norms of party ethics, the slightest violation of socialist legality, will immediately receive the fitting assessment of both the party masses and also of higher bodies. For this we need to develop on an even broader scale principled criticism, resolutely cut short all attempts to suppress it, and even more so, cut short persecution because of it. It is apt to remind those who suffer from excessive self-importance and have not been trained to listen to opposite points of view of one of Lenin's thoughts: "It is necessary not to see either 'intrigue' or a 'counterweight' in persons who think differently or who approach things differently, but to value independent people" (op. cit., vol 54, p 73), to value them not according to the services they render but according to their merits.

In work with cadres it is necessary to develop in every possible way democratic principles and extend the practice of appointment by election and competitions for the appointment of posts and of systematic public reporting back to working people. It is necessary that the primary party organization in which this or that leader ranging from foreman to minister finds himself should be in the know when he receives not only lofty awards but also party penalties. The constant influx of fresh forces and the skillful combination of experienced cadres of the older generations with young promising workers is also necessary.

Particularly as regards economic cadres, supreme adherence to party and ideological principles, competence and responsibility, and the skill to work together with people is required of them today in the same way as it is of all leaders. But this is not enough. The skill to think in economically literate and modern terms and to strive for effectiveness and intensive factors of growth is necessary. It is necessary to get right away from the stereotyped ways of thinking that have come about under which the quantitative, gross figures approach has clearly predominated over the qualitative.

A warning against a dangerous misconception is necessary: Certain party committees, proceeding from the generally correct assumption that the state of affairs in some area of work depends, to a decisive degree, on those in charge of it, start convulsively changing, one after another, their farm chairmen or

factory directors, for example, without bothering to give them practical, concrete help. It goes without saying that this practice does no good.

To the CPSU, any kind of arrogance inspired by its position as the vanguard is fundamentally alien. On the contrary, it does everything to raise all the working people to the level of the vanguard by virtue of their awareness, their understanding of the laws of social development and of modern politics, by their social activeness. And here, there is an enormous role for ideological work, for taking socialist consciousness to the masses. By its very nature, this is a profoundly democratic and humane task.

Unless the working people have a sound grasp of ideology and morality of the working class and a deep understanding of the policy of the CPSU, it is inconceivable that society should be strongly united ideologically, politically and socially, or that the people should rally closely around the party. Only on the basis of a lofty idea, expressing the prospect of social development and the fundamental interests of the people, can true orderliness and intelligent discipline be achieved both in the party and in society.

Of course, the tasks of ideological education are not confined to the dissemination of scientific ideology and the organizing of profound study of it on a massive scale. This work is an effective tool for operatively, systematically, comprehensively and convincingly informing the masses regarding current questions of our policy. It can be said to be a wide window onto a complex, troubled and constantly changing world.

We also take into account the enormous role of propaganda as a means of obtaining "feedback" from the masses. The broad and free expression of people's opinions in the pages of the press; detailed and extensive discussion of decisions which are being made, and businesslike criticism from below, workers' letters, all this is, as it were, a reliable mechanism of insurance against voluntarism and subjectivism in politics, making it possible to select optimal solutions and to make, in good time, such changes to them as are prompted by life itself.

Let me note particularly the need for CONSISTENT OBSERVANCE OF LENIN'S PRINCIPLE OF THE UNITY OF IDEOLOGICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL WORK. As we advance on the ideological-theoretical front, it behooves us to redouble our efforts in political propaganda, and to direct it toward mobilizing the masses for resolving the tasks of economic and sociopolitical development; to reinforce our ideological activity by organizational and economic work.

We have every reason to note positive changes in ideological work since the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. But these are only the first steps. Much still remains to be done if the content, the promptness, the forms and methods of our propaganda and its material-technical base, are to meet the increased requirements of Soviet people, and the tasks of perfecting developed socialism and of taking the offensive in the struggle against bourgeois ideology; and if we are to extirpate from the practice of propaganda the pursuit of the resounding phrase, the tedious cliches and the attempts to evade acute questions that are of urgent concern to the working people.

The CPSU Central Committee will hold this sector of work constantly within its field of vision and require that it be given the most fixed attention by all party committees and every member of the party. One must not forget that the class enemy tries to make use of any failures here in order to infiltrate among us views and values that are alien to socialism. We must continue to educate the citizens of the land of the soviets and our young people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian socialist internationalism, of loyalty to the fatherland and the ideals of the October Revolution. It is particularly important now to use in this work the approaching 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War.

The strength and the authority of the party are the authority of every communist, the strength of his personal example. To a large extent people judge the party, its policy, and its ideology by the actions and the behavior of the communist. This is why it is important to safeguard and to raise ever higher the calling and the importance of the member of the party. It is important to seek to ensure that within its ranks are indeed the best representatives of the people, the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

The best, because communists take upon themselves everything that is the most difficult; with a knowledge of the matter in hand they boldly raise and solve the most complex social and political tasks, and they do not fear the historic responsibility that has been placed upon their shoulders. They bear it with complete consciousness of their party and civic duty. The best, because they enter the party not for the sake of any honor and privilege, but in the name of serving the lofty ideals of socialism and the interests of the working people.

All this makes communists a force which, to use the words of Marx and Engels, is "most resolute and always inducing movement forward..." (op. cit., vol 4, p 437). Now, when the CPSU is moving to meet the 27th Congress in carrying out a searching review of its party affairs, it would appear to be particularly appropriate to recall these words by the founders of our revolutionary teaching.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984.

CSO: 1802/6

TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE ALL-UNION SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE ON
"THE PERFECTION OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM AND THE PARTY'S IDEOLOGICAL WORK IN THE
LIGHT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE JUNE 1983 CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

LD101344 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84)
p 22-23

[Message by K. Chernenko]

[Text] Comrades: I cordially greet the participants in the scientific and practical conference.

It is taking place 1.5 years after the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which directed the efforts of party organizations at resolutely raising ideological work to the level of the great and complex creative tasks being solved by the party and people today and to take better account of the realities of today's world situation and the aggravation of the ideological struggle in the international arena.

It is evident how important it is comprehensively to interpret the experience that has been accumulated and to thoroughly analyze how the ideas and directives of the plenum are being put into practice. The main thing, however, is to discuss and outline the work that is to be done and where attention must be primarily concentrated in order to fully use the active and transforming strength of our ideology in solving the vital economic and social problems and in the communist education of the working people.

The subject of the conference is an extremely topical one. The party and people are today equipped with the concept of developed socialism. This concept gives us a strictly scientific idea of our immediate and long-term aims and how to achieve them, and forms the basis of the new edition of the CPSU Program, which is in preparation. Profoundly understanding the political meaning of the thoroughly balanced and realistic strategy for the perfection of developed socialism, which has been drawn up by the party, and being able to closely link it with the practice of propaganda and education work are the primary duty of ideological cadres and the whole party aktiv.

Today, we can say with full justification that the ideas of the June Plenum and of the subsequent plenums of the Central Committee have entered the consciousness of millions of people and are taking material shape in practical

deeds, positive changes in the national economy, and steadfast improvement in the well-being of the masses and the growth of their political and labor activity. At the same time, we must look forward, have a clear idea of the unsolved questions, and move forward more rapidly toward the targets that have been set.

Recently, on more than one occasion I have had to note that our society faces qualitatively new tasks that require the mobilization of all the people's creative potential and a certain reorientation of the social consciousness. Here the importance of ideological and political education work is exceptionally great. It raises millions of Soviet people to selfless struggle for the intensification of production, the acceleration of scientific and technological progress and the economical use of material resources and high productivity at every work place.

Party committees have at their disposal a rich arsenal of forms, ways and means of organizing and educating the masses. Making skillful use of these everywhere is one of the most important requirements of the Leninist work style. Their characteristic features are realism, broad reliance on science and knowledge of and consideration for people's interests and requirements.

On this basis alone, the propaganda of our ideals, the historic gains of the country of the October Revolution, and its domestic and foreign policy can be made convincing and easily understood, and high ideological conviction, moral steadfastness and patriotic and internationalist feelings can be formed in the Soviet people. Such propaganda is an effective weapon against any "psychological" attacks by the class enemy and his attempts to slander socialism and to slow our forward progress.

I am sure that a businesslike analysis of ideological and propaganda practice and the concrete proposals by the participants in the conference will promote the solution of the large-scale and responsible tasks of perfecting the socialism that has been built in the USSR and the increase of theoretical and propaganda work that is under way in the party in connection with preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress.

From the bottom of my heart, I wish you, dear comrades, success in your work.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984.

CSO: 1802/6

SHEVARNADZE VIEWS PROBLEMS OF YOUTH EDUCATION

AU140601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, December 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 24-36

[Article by E. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia: "Educating Young People Through Personal Example"]

[Text] Abroad, or meeting with prominent party and state figures, communists and members of workers parties, one frequently hears the question: What place do young people's problems occupy in CPSU activities? And each time one has to point out the anomaly of posing the question in this way, because it is like asking what place in life is occupied by the education of one's own children.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that further improving the education of the younger generation is a most important party, state and national cause, because it is ultimately a question of reliably safeguarding the future of our motherland.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Improving Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Enhancing Its Role in the Communist Education of Young People," which was adopted on the eve of the 60th anniversary of the Komsomol's adoption of the name of Vladimir I'lich Lenin, was a fresh manifestation of the party's fatherly concern for the Komsomol and for its country's young people.

This most important party document, the works and speeches of Comrade K. U. Chernenko, including his speech at the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations, and the theses and conclusions contained in his speech to the leaders of youth organizations in socialist countries once again strongly remind us that improving the communist education of young people and perfecting Komsomol party leadership is a constant, uninterrupted process. In many ways our progress toward communism depends on how successful we are in this work. This is why the party devotes such great attention to the problems of the communist education of young people at the stage of developed socialism. Aware of the importance of this task, communists in Georgia pursue a precise and consistent policy to further improve the party leadership of the Komsomol organizations' activities and to enhance their role in the communist

education of the republic's young people. Examining youth problems at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia in October this year, we strove in every possible way to ensure that the approach to these problems was precisely that required by the party--party, state and national.

A profoundly party approach to these problems was evident in the fact that, in the very process of preparing for the plenum, issues relating to its agenda were discussed beforehand at all levels--from party-Komsomol meetings in primary organizations to plenary meetings of party raykoms, gorkoms and obkoms. Our striving to achieve a truly state approach to resolving the aforementioned problems was attested to by the fact that the tasks of improving work with young people were examined in detail at meetings of the presidiums of the supreme soviets of the Georgian SSR and its autonomous republics, as well as at meetings of the executive committees of the local soviets of people's deputies, permanent commissions for youth affairs and ministerial and departmental collegia.

We tried to ensure that this approach was truly national in nature and that the problems of educating the younger generation and shaping the individual were discussed in all of the republic's labor collectives, social organizations and creative unions. Tens of thousands of replies were written in response to the Letter of the Communist People, and to all the working people of the republic, which was published a month before our plenum was convened. A discussion of youth problems was conducted on the pages of the republican and local press, and in television and radio programs.

One must also mention here the meetings with various categories of young people which were held before the plenum in virtually all ministries and departments, and in central institutions and creative unions. Such meetings were also held in the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee with the participation of its secretaries and heads of departments. The frank, very interesting, and detailed talk with bureau members and heads of departments of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol, and also with a group of secretaries of primary Komsomol organizations and representatives of the Komsomol aktiv made a strong impression on me. Such meetings are not a chance episode in our activities. We attach great significance to personal contacts between leaders of the republic and young people, and we systematically meet with various categories of young people at enterprises, on building sites, in kolkhozes and sovkhoses in higher education institutes, dormitories and so forth. Contacts of this kind make it possible to penetrate deeper into youth problems, understand young people better and be more keenly aware of their needs. I shall never forget meetings and talks at Tbilisi State University, the Georgian Polytechnical Institute, in scientific laboratories, creative organizations and other youth collectives, at entertainment establishments, in social places and sometimes simply on the street. The keen, frank discussions about the most vital and most topical problems of the contemporary era are still fresh in my memory. One receives real satisfaction from meetings such as these.

A truly frank discussion with young people and about young people was then held at the plenary meeting of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee.

Frankness is a most important principle in relations with young people. We have the most confidential discussions with them on the most vital issues. This practice was begun by the well-known CPSU Central Committee resolution on the Tbilisi party gorkom, which was adopted in 1972. It was precisely then that the republic's party organization advanced as one of its main tasks: "Face the Problems of Young People." Since then youth problems have constantly been at the center of our attention and, one can say, have not been removed from the agenda. During all these years we have tried not to let slip a single opportunity to make contact with young people and talk with them frankly and intimately. In this respect, there have been meetings of the student aktiv, gatherings of school pupils with excellent marks, aktivs of the best young production workers in the branch, meetings between young people and instructors and party veterans and traditional New Year's meetings. All this is without mentioning participation by the leaders of the republic's party organization in the work of Komsomol congresses and plenary meetings of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol.

There is every ground for claiming that meetings with young people, contact with them, and concern for their education are for us an inner need and, what is more, a vitally important need. In this work our prime tasks are those of forming a harmoniously developed individual and cultivating those qualities in young people that acquire special, decisive significance at the stage of developed socialism.

In contemporary conditions the truly harmoniously developed individual must be characterized by moral-political qualities which can be summed up in one concise concept--political awareness. Helping to raise the level of political awareness of every young individual is our prime party, civic and, if you like, paternal, parental duty.

Political awareness is a broad concept. Its interpretation can also vary. However, the main substance of this concept can, perhaps, be reduced to one simple and plain truth: the broadest possible democratic rights granted to every individual by developed socialist society can only be enjoyed by those who conscientiously fulfill their civic responsibilities. This means, on the one hand, that the political awareness of an individual presupposes knowledge of his rights and responsibilities, and on the other, an ability on his part to enjoy these rights and to be prepared to honestly fulfill his responsibilities to society and to the people. This kind of attitude toward life must be formed from childhood, when the most favorable soil exists for cultivating it.

And it is not simply a matter of the individual being more easily susceptible to the influence of his environment when he is young, or that he is more receptive to the broad stream of diverse information which he literally soaks up. One must also bear in mind an important feature which is frequently overlooked in the process of educational work with young people. All the best features characteristic of the harmoniously developed individual, such as love

for people, internationalism, patriotism, self-sacrifice, aspiration to lofty deeds, openness of soul--they can all fundamentally be formed in virtually every individual. And in subsequent educational work it is extremely important to know how to develop these "beautiful impulses of the soul" and to try not to conceal, extinguish, or allow them to subside. But this does happen when educational work is conducted uncreatively, formally and in a hackneyed manner. Young people are always quick to notice any falsity and react against it very strongly. It must also be borne in mind that each new generation is always more informed and more developed than the previous one. In this lies great wealth for the community of mankind. Mankind grows wiser from generation to generation and becomes more perfect and it would be unforgivably frivolous to brush aside such an obvious fact. On the contrary, this dialectical law of social development must be taken into maximum account in relations with young people.

While perfecting forms and methods of work with young people it should be borne in mind that, in discussions with them, dialogue is most appropriate of all and mutual respect is compulsory. An active, leading role in such a dialogue must, as a rule, be played by representatives of the older generation, but they must conduct this dialogue honestly, frankly, with tact and with adherence to principle, without playing up to young people, but also without trying to give them orders. One should not constantly impose predetermined truths on young people--they must be given the opportunity to think things over, discover for themselves the essence, and understand this essence not only intellectually, but also with their hearts. It is only under this condition that they will be able to acquire the qualities of a political fighter.

While arguing in favor of constant dialogue with young people and being aware of the fact that, under conditions of socialism, there is not and cannot be antagonism between the generations. We must not forget that youth will be youth and that relations between people belonging to different generations will always be affected to a greater or lesser degree by age differences and an insufficient amount of experience of life in one case and a wealth of this experience in the other.

The originality of the trodden path definitely leaves its special mark on the individual's consciousness and way of thinking, and on his attitude to the phenomena of life. The problem of fathers and sons has always been and will remain one of the most serious and topical. However, all this can in no way prevent us, communists and representatives of the older generation, from working with young people, comprehensively strengthening our contacts and our relations with the younger generation and being sensitive to the problems that trouble young people.

While broadening dialogue with young people, emphasizing their equality with adults in many matters, showing constant concern for them, and giving them our interested attention, we communists must clearly explain to every young person the range of his responsibilities to society and the state. The Soviet Constitution must be the basic law of life for our young people. It is important to ensure that all young people are fully aware of their great responsibility to society for the fulfillment of their official and civic

duties, and that they firmly grasp the fact that they will be called to account for improper conduct or an unscrupulous attitude to matters.

While cultivating political awareness in young people one must be constantly concerned with ensuring that every young person is fully aware of the unity of personal and social interests, and that he firmly grasps the fact that the embodiment of his moral ideals is possible only through the fulfillment of social ideals. Cultivating communist conviction in the younger generation is a central task of the whole of our ideological work. And it is no accident that internationalist and military-patriotic education, the formation of a communist attitude to work, and struggle against private ownership tendencies, unhealthy traditions, vestiges of the past and antisocial acts occupy such a large place in work with young people.

In recent years public order has been considerably strengthened in the republic and the amount of crime among young people is diminishing. However, the criminal manifestations still encountered among young people cause serious concern. The root of these manifestations lies in a private ownership, consumerist psychology and morals, and in the influence of bourgeois ideology on the awareness of certain young people that has not yet been fully overcome.

It is very difficult, if not simply impossible for man to live without ideals and without faith in their triumph. If we are not quick enough in convincing him of the rightness of our ideas and do not cultivate a Marxist-Leninist world outlook in him, then he can easily find himself in the power of a value orientation alien to us and fall, for example, under the influence of religion and unhealthy world outlook trends. The ideals of our party fully meet the most demanding spiritual needs of present-day youth and the struggle to fulfill these ideals widens the scope for young people's social growth and for the application of their creative powers and energy. But this does not mean at all that we have a right to approach the problems of young people's ideological education superficially or in a hackneyed way. We must not do this also for the reason that our young people, living in socialist society conditions, are in no position to become enriched with practical experience of the class struggle. And that is why we must show great political vigilance and teach young people to have a sharpened class sense in order to be confident that our young people will not falter or bend under the weight of their historic responsibility for the fate of the country.

"The party committees have at their disposal a rich arsenal of forms, means and methods of organizing and educating the masses," noted Comrade K. U. Chernenko in his speech of welcome to the participants in the All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference 'Perfecting Developed Socialism and Ideological Work in Light of the Decisions of the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum.'

"The skillful utilization of these forms, means and methods everywhere is one of the most important requirements of the Leninist style of work. Realism, extensive reliance upon science and knowledge of and consideration for the interests and needs of the people are characteristic of this style.

"It is on this basis alone that one can ensure the convincing and intelligible nature of the propaganda of our ideals, the historic achievements of the land of the October Revolution, and its domestic and foreign policy and the formation of great ideological conviction, moral stability, and patriotic and internationalist sentiments in Soviet people. This propaganda is an effective weapon against any 'psychological' attacks from the class enemy and against his attempts to blacken socialism and slow down our progress."

We very strongly believe that an incorrect understanding of internationalism and patriotism leads to serious deformation of the individual's awareness and his political make-up. True patriotism primarily presupposes a thorough grasp, from well-defined class positions, of the objective, historically conditioned requirements of the social and spiritual progress of one's people and one's motherland, as well as readiness to assist this progress through one's selfless, creative labor and the exertion of all of one's intellectual moral and physical powers.

The contemporary military-political situation in the world dictates the necessity of combining as closely as possible the ideological-political and internationalist tempering of the younger generation with its military-patriotic education. The sacred sense of being the defender of one's motherland must be formed in the individual from a young age. It is with this aim that party and Komsomol organizations in the republic closely cooperate with the political organs of the Zakavkazye military and frontier districts. Young people regularly meet with soldiers from the Soviet Army, and many labor collectives and academic institutions have established permanent and varied ties with military units. A complex of measures is being implemented for preparing young people for going into military service and so forth.

Guided by the aforementioned considerations, the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee draws the special attention of the party and Komsomol organizations to the necessity of overcoming formalism in ideological work with young people.

Since the bureau of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee and the collegium of the Ministry of Education in the republic adopted a joint resolution in 1978 on the struggle against manifestations of formalism in educational work among young people, after which this problem was discussed at an all-republic Komsomol meeting, an atmosphere of irreconcilability toward any such manifestations has begun to establish itself in the life of the Komsomol organizations.

We hold the opinion that formalism is not only a sign of indifference to the needs of young people, but that it is also evidence of incompetent Komsomol party leadership. A rise in the level of this leadership is evident in the fundamental improvement in the practice of studying public opinion in young people's environment and their current frame of mind. The Center for the Study, Formulation and Prediction of Public Opinion functions under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, which provides party organizations with vital help in analyzing and selecting ways of resolving many topical economic and social development problems. We intend to form a similar mechanism in the republic's Komsomol organization in order to conduct

work among young people on a systematic basis and in a purposeful way, penetrate more deeply every problem that troubles young people, and the processes taking place in their environment, and skillfully control these processes.

Our party organization consistently fulfills its set task of making the educational process continuous, beginning with kindergarten and the first grade of the general educational school, where for more than 10 years now education has been provided in our republic from 6 years of age. We devote a great deal of attention to work of the Pioneer organization, where the active social maturing of the juvenile and his political formation begin. A firm basis for so comprehensively and fully including the younger generation in educational work has been created by a multifaceted group of measures aimed at cardinally improving the labor, political and moral education of young people. The large-scale measures, approved by the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and then also by the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation, are very correctly called a reform. It is really a very far-reaching reform, making it possible to lay a reliable foundation for the individual's education in the broadest sense of the word--educating an ardent patriot and true internationalist and a citizen of the coming century. Today the nationally approved school reform is a most important link in the whole ideological-educational process.

The republic devotes a great deal of attention to enhancing the role and increasing the responsibility of parents. The mistakes of family upbringing are difficult to rectify. Consequently those parents who encourage parasitical, consumer sentiments in their children and indulge manifestations of individualism and unreasonable demands must be strictly called to account in the party spirit.

The bureau of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee has adopted a special resolution aimed at enhancing the role of the family and increasing the responsibility of parents in the political, ideological-moral education of the younger generation. Parents' societies have been formed in many cities and rayons in the republic, which have their own departments and branches in labor collectives. A streamlined system is thus taking shape which embraces all units of the educational process, beginning with school and ending with work conducted with families and parents in places of residence via public councils in the microrayons. We strive in every possible way to ensure the close, organic combination and firm fusion of concerned paternal attention and strict exactingness and exacting, truly parental demand. To be as strict as possible and absolutely fair, as befits good parents--this is an unshakable rule of education which we must all invariably uphold.

I would say that a great role is played by that strong ideological instrument--literature and art--in a well thought out, purposeful, tactful and delicate approach to the problems of educational influence on young people. That is why we attach great significance to the ideological formation of those who tomorrow will take this instrument in their hands. Educating creative young people is one of the most responsible and complex sectors of our entire ideological work. Not only the future of our literature and art depends on the ethical and aesthetic categories by which the young creative

intelligentsia is guided, but also the spiritual potential of the entire younger generation.

Today the republic's creative young people have excellent opportunities for revealing their talents and increasing their artistic skill. The potentials for publishing works by new authors and producing movie films and performances, and works of other genres and art forms have recently sharply increased. Meetings among representatives of the creative intelligentsia have become more frequent.

In the education of creative young people we proceed from the fact that they not only need lessons in professional skills, but also lessons in morality, civic courage, adherence to principle and party zeal and honesty.

These lessons are particularly important for ensuring that young people are able to successfully withstand petty themes, and blind emulation of inferior specimens of bourgeois "mass culture," and materialism, which has not only become widespread in the everyday lives of some young people but is also felt in artistic creativity.

The problem of cultivating reasonable demands in our young people acquires particular significance in connection with the further swift growth of the country's economic potential and the improvement in the material well-being of the people. In this respect we by no means envisage artificially limiting or reducing these demands. A reasonable attitude toward the consumption of material commodities society provides is what is required. And a large role is played by literature and art in the cultivation of this reasonable attitude.

Now, when with every passing year people live better and better lives, when the working people's wages are increasing and real incomes are growing, and in the conditions of free education and medical aid, low rent, and affordable prices for products of prime necessity, the problem of what else to spend one's means on arises naturally for the individual who has everything most essential for life. In this respect it is very important to ensure that every worker understands that, first, he should not demand of society more than it is capable of providing at a given moment and, second, that he must at the same time make skillful, rational use of the goods provided. Cultivating reasonable demands is a most important problem in the communist education of young people at the contemporary stage of our development, because no abundance will be able to satisfy the unbridled consumer.

But the main thing is not to lose sight of spiritual needs behind material requirements and not to forget that one must cultivate good taste in oneself and strengthen one's understanding of the fact that happiness by no means lies in the endless acquisition of goods and that the main highway to happiness runs through the sphere of spiritual life. It is true happiness to be able to listen to music, find enjoyment in every good book and take pleasure in a good theater performance, an outstanding painting, an architectural monument, or a piece of sculpture. It is an invaluable gift to be able to differentiate between true artistic creativity and a mechanical, inferior, false imitation of real art. Consequently, we regard one of our prime tasks as forming high

cultural needs in young people, as well as a vital need to grasp artistic values, introducing them to what is beautiful in the world, and developing the habit of constantly engaging in physical culture and sport.

The further our society progresses along the path of perfecting developed socialism, the more these problems will come into the forefront and the more serious they will become. We also strive to conduct work in this sphere on a systemic basis and to adopt a systemic approach. We intend to discuss in the near future--at a plenary meeting of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee or at a meeting of the party aktiv--topical problems connected with further developing culture, including literature and art, in the conditions of mature socialism, while drawing on the theses and conclusions contained in the speech made by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the jubilee plenary meeting of the board of the USSR Union of Writers.

Here it is very important not to permit underestimation of any negative trends which sometimes arise in the young people's environment. However weak these trends are in themselves, they require close study, analysis and, of course, active and skillful counteraction. Imperialism's ideological services frequently dress anti-Soviet, reactionary content in the most attractive form. It is senseless, for example, to reject contemporary fashion if it is also practical, comfortable and pleasant to look at.

But one must look very carefully into the symbolism accompanying this fashion which sometimes runs counter to the principles of humanism and glorifies cruelty and violence. One can also fully understand our young people's interest in foreign music, including contemporary music. However, young people must be taught to differentiate between really highly artistic contemporary musical works and those which pursue purely commercial, or even overtly anti-Soviet aims. In a word, young people's enthusiasm must be concretely and substantively influenced, while simultaneously cultivating love and respect in them for the best achievements of their national culture.

The youth and party press, television, and radio make a great contribution to the ideological formation of the younger generation. There is a great deal that is interesting and deserving of attention in their work. For example, almost half of all television programs have recently been oriented toward the young audience. The Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee has directed the mass information media to more thoroughly and clearly elucidate youth problems and to actively participate in the communist education of the younger generation.

The formation of great awareness and conviction in young people is indissolubly connected with the development of their initiative and independence. Let young people be more daring. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko has graphically said, we cannot "keep young people in diapers" all their lives. We must put more trust in them, entrust them with serious tasks and then demand their fulfillment. Excessive regulation and petty guardianship only damages the Komsomol and limits the creative search and initiative of young people.

It is precisely from those positions that the republic's party organization approaches leadership of the Komsomol. Komsomol members in Georgia increasingly frequently take up concrete tasks and are entrusted with concrete responsibilities. For example, our Komsomol members are patrons of every third type of product manufactured with the state mark of quality, the construction of the Tbilisi-Akhalkalaki Trailway, the development of social livestock breeding, the development of not very fertile areas and wastelands, and the curtailing of the practice of thinning out old plantations. Young people have wholly taken the responsibility upon themselves for developing lemon groves and cultivating nut trees.

We intend to entrust the Komsomol organs with resolving problems connected with organizing the work, everyday life and the leisure of young people at enterprises where chiefly young people's collectives work. Here we are counting on the initiative and aggressiveness of Komsomol members in resolving serious social problems. We also intend to place the recruiting of young specialists for mountainous regions and rural areas, and the distribution and appointing of graduates from higher education institutes and technical schools under the control of the Komsomol. The Komsomol organizations can also do a great deal in improving the labor education of students, perfecting the work of preschool institutions and kindergartens and so forth.

The Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee requires the republic's party organizations to entrust the Komsomol with more practical matters and to create every condition for them to be able to really show their creative potentials. Komsomol committees and Komsomol leaders are primarily directed to conduct lively work directly among young people. We require them to ensure that they do not cut themselves off from people their own age and lock themselves away in offices, but that they catch up with everything of value that springs up in the provinces and support any useful initiative.

The economy occupies a special place among the many spheres in which the Komsomol expends effort. It is here that the results of educational work among the young generation and all this generation's qualities manifest themselves most clearly and concretely.

The work hardening received in the years of one's youth is irreplaceable capital.

A powerful economy is the basis and the foundation of all the social wealth which society gives to its citizens. It is very important for every young person to grasp well this fact and be guided by it very consciously in his everyday life and working activities, and also to define correctly his place and role in his life and work and his contribution to further accelerating social progress. For this our young people must persistently strive to master the fundamentals of scientific thinking, and primarily economic thinking.

A high level of economic thinking primarily presupposes the conscious concern of every worker to increase his labor productivity and the efficiency of his activities and to improve their basic evaluation indices. Efficient shock work must bring the individual happiness. He will be able to experience this

happiness only if he is well aware of the concrete benefit he has brought his native collective, rayon, city, republic and country.

A fairly good grape harvest was cultivated this year in the republic. It was important to ensure its maximum possible durable storage. The grapes, therefore, had to be picked in the shortest possible time. Here students gave rural workers invaluable help. We were forced to tear them away from their studies, although in this case it was only to their benefit. They were well tempered by the work, set examples of high efficiency, and mainly saw the results of this work firsthand and were thus aware of their real contribution to fulfilling the tasks facing the republic.

A conscientious attitude to work and knowledge of the basic components of socioeconomic growth and increased production efficiency must be formed from the earliest years. We consider, for example, how to ensure practically that a Pioneer collecting scrap metal or waste paper realizes of what concrete benefit this is to his school. We ponder over the organization of competition between students from vocational-technical schools which would make it possible to take into account labor productivity indices, the prime costs of products manufactured by them, and the quality of these products, and which would also make it possible for the young people themselves to participate in the necessary calculations. Such possibilities for young people's creativity are considerable, and the Komsomol organizations are now actively engaged in seeking them.

From our point of view, the proposal made by the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee on introducing a separate registration of the labor contribution of young people and receiving fuller information on the numerical strength of young people working in the different branches of the national economy, the level of their labor productivity, the quality of the products they manufacture, and the state of labor discipline among young workers deserves attention. This is a complex problem, but its solution will make it possible to more actively influence the processes of forming young people and to control these processes with greater purposefulness and concreteness. This proposal made by Komsomol members, therefore, will have to be considered.

The proposal also merits attention because the republic's Komsomol organizations have been given the task of comprehensively and on a qualitatively new level helping to swell the ranks of the workers class and the kolkhoz peasantry, considering the limited nature of labor resources. In other words, the professional training of young cadres must be improved, the level of their knowledge raised, and the formation of them of economically competent thinking and an interested attitude toward scientific-technical progress must be ensured.

The creation of an appropriate cadre reserve is increasingly becoming a sphere of practical activity for the Komsomol.

At the same time the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee orients the Komsomol organizations toward fulfilling certain organizational functions connected with production management. They are not only responsible for recording shortcomings, but also for adopting concrete measures to eliminate

them. The task lies in ensuring that Komsomol members do not shift the responsibility for resolving production problems onto the shoulders of their older comrades, but that they themselves show concern for production growth, the regular work of their enterprises, and the efficient usage of resources--in a word, that they learn to be true, interested and zealous managers, are capable of reckoning state money and have a careful attitude toward national property.

Our young people already make a great contribution to the development of the republic's national economy. As its production potential increases further, the role of the Komsomol organizations in the resolving of economic problems will steadily grow. Young people are called upon to most actively participate in building the Caucasus Pass railway, commissioning a number of new, large-scale production units in contemporary branches of industry, regenerating and socially transforming mountain villages, and intensifying the agroindustrial complex. These tasks can be successfully fulfilled only if every Komsomol worker penetrates deeply into the problems of further perfecting the economic mechanism and improving work organization, persistently strives to master the fundamentals of economic knowledge, and, the main thing, comprehensively helps to ensure that young people begin their active working lives already prepared for fulfilling the tasks facing the republic and the entire country and armed with the knowledge necessary for this.

We believe that scientific-technical progress--the main path to further socioeconomic development--must become the prime concern of our young people and the general direction of Komsomol work in the sphere of the economy. It is precisely young people who are called upon to strive to practically fulfill party requirements for combining the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution with the socialist organization of economic operations. Creative daring and boldness, and also original thinking, are particularly characteristic of young people, they are not yet weighed down by the inertia of many years' experience, and it is easier for them to readapt and master new, progressive ideas.

How is the aforementioned task being fulfilled in the republic's party organization? First, concern for the working and living conditions of young scientists, engineers, designers and planners has been intensified and comprehensive assistance is being given to introducing their discoveries, inventions and elaborations into the national economy. Councils, commissions and working groups have been formed under the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee and the local party committee, which are concerned with scientific-technical progress and coordinate all work done in this sphere. The Komsomol organizations take a most active and direct part in this work. Second, the overwhelming majority of students are being drawn into scientific activities, the theme of which is increasingly bound up with the requirements of real practice. These activities yield concrete results in various spheres of economic operations and make it possible at the same time to actively discover young people capable of scientific creativity. Third, the general educational and vocational training of students in the process of mastering economic and technical knowledge is being combined and the technical creativity of young people and students encouraged.

Fourth, partnership and cooperation between young people at scientific, production and academic organizations are being developed and their joint efforts concentrated on resolving concrete problems. And, finally, the organizational forms and methods of participation by Komsomol organs in the management of scientific-technical progress are being perfected.

The present generation of young people will be living and working in the 21st century, at the beginning of the third millennium of the new era. It is difficult, if not impossible to imagine in every detail what this century will be like and what demands it will make on the individual.

But there is no doubt that with its arrival the scale of the historic competition between two opposing social systems--socialism and capitalism--will grow. Losing one position after another before our very eyes, capitalism and imperialism are becoming increasingly reactionary and aggressive. And that is why young people of all ages are today faced with the problems of humanism. And the problems of war and peace and the very existence of civilization on earth. The main prerequisite for liquidating the existing danger is to strengthen world socialism and increase the Soviet Union's economic and defense might--the main deciding factor in the preservation and strengthening of peace on earth. This is our class duty, and the younger generation of the land of the October Revolution must fulfill this duty totally and utterly by showing their increasing political vigilance and strengthening organization and discipline.

It is natural to think of the continuity of the generations on the threshold of the new millennium. Continuity is not only young people's continuation of what was begun by previous generations, but also the ability to develop this, raise it to a qualitatively new level, and go further in creative daring and plans. That is why young people must persistently study and arm themselves with all the best things that we today possess, and having increased accumulated experience with their knowledge and increased intellect, hasten the coming of a bright and beautiful communist future.

However important in itself a given aspect of the ideological-moral formation of today's young people may be, the force of communists' personal example is of decisive significance in this most important all-party cause. Our young people inherit their moral-political position from the older generations, which must set young people a worthy example for emulation, just as we were set an example by the revolutionary, combat and working traditions of the Bolsheviks-Leninists, participants in the Stakhanovite movement, and the heroic defenders of our socialist fatherland during the years of war against the fascist invaders.

Purity of the party ranks, high exactingness toward communists and irreproachable fulfillment by them of all the duties stipulated by the CPSU Statute--this is one of the most important conditions of correct party leadership of the Komsomol organizations, a condition which gives us the moral right to make heightened demands on young people. In other words, if we wish to improve Komsomol work and enhance its role we must primarily improve work with communists. The main thing is to increase their responsibility to the party and the people.

Certain experience in this matter has also been accumulated by the republican party organization: party certification of leading cadres when they are accountable to the bureau of party committees; confirmation of the characterizations of those appointed to a new position, promoted, or transferred to another job; the practice of enhancing the role of the primary party organizations in the selection and distribution of cadres and much more.

All this is aimed at further deepening internal party democracy and at steadily increasing the responsibility of the cadres.

However, unfortunately there are still some communists in our republic who can in no way serve as an example for emulation in their attitude to work and who sometimes conduct themselves unworthily in their personal lives. Every communist must have the moral right to demand moral purity from young people. Otherwise this very demand becomes amoral.

Life and practice have made it necessary to begin very complex and painstaking work in the republic's party organizations to create a system for thoroughly studying the practical and political qualities of every communist. The time has come to ensure that every communist is, as they say, "as clear as the lines on the palm of one's hand" and that the party organization knows everything about him. It is important for the communist himself to feel that he is constantly under the eyes of his party organization and that he is controlled by it. It is well known that "the party has one discipline and one law for all communists irrespective of their service and the posts they occupy." The party member must invariably meet this statutory requirement all his life.

It seems expedient to us to establish a system whereby every communist after a certain period of time, such as every 5 years, for example, from congress to congress, will give an account of himself to his party organization. In this respect his party characterization, containing a concrete, objective and impartial appraisal of the communist's work, his conduct, attitude to the cause and fulfillment of party tasks--his entire way of life--must, we feel, be confirmed every time at the party meeting. Also, for example, how he brings up his children and fulfills his parental responsibilities. It must be a social portrait of the communist which represents a characterization of his practical, political and human qualities containing references to his shortcomings, errors and mistakes and recommendations for eliminating these shortcomings. And the communist must know that the time will definitely come when he will have to report to the party organization on what he has done as a result of the criticism addressed to him, what lessons he has drawn for himself, and how he is ridding himself of his shortcomings.

This kind of approach is already being adopted in the republic's party organizations. Reports are being heard by several thousand communists and their party characterizations being confirmed. The first results are highly interesting and attest to the effectiveness of this practice of party certification. Communists relate approvingly to this practice and believe that it helps to strengthen the party ranks, develop criticism and self-criticism and mutual exactingness, and improve the moral-political climate in

the party organizations. The purity of party ranks and the personal example of the communist are indissolubly linked concepts.

Let us recall the constant and exacting concern shown by Lenin regarding the purity of party ranks--he pointed out the necessity of "protecting our party's firmness, steadfastness and purity...and trying to raise the title and significance of the party member higher, higher and still higher" and emphasized that "we have no need of show party members" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 7, pp 290-291; vol 39, p 224).

The whole of Lenin's life and activities are the loftiest example of how a communist must struggle for the purity of party ranks. In all our work we are bound to strictly adhere to the Leninist principle: "...Every party member is responsible for the party and the party is responsible for every member ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 7, p 290).

The experience accumulated in the party organizations is also assimilated by the republic's Komsomol while taking into account, of course, the specific features of its own work. The fact that the Komsomol organizations are today increasing the spontaneous activities, independence and initiative of Komsomol members in every possible way, as well as their activeness and their responsibility to their comrades merits attention. And we are sure that the Komsomol will arm itself from the arsenal of party organization work with everything of value that is appropriate to the conditions of the work done by youth organizations.

The future fate of various party, state and social life sectors in many ways also depends on how well talented people are selected for Komsomol work. The process of training and selecting cadres is long and complex. That is why it is so important not to make any mistakes at the very beginning of this path.

And let every communist and every Komsomol member complete, with the help of his primary organization and sharp, principled criticism and self-criticism, the process of self-perfection, so that he will be able to firmly and confidently say: "My conscience before the party is clear." Yes, it must be ensured that every individual attends a party congress with a clear conscience. And only thus, with a clear conscience, must we set about further improving party leadership of the Komsomol and enhancing its role in the communist education of young people.

We are proud of our fine young people, our Komsomol members, their glorious achievements, the high moral make-up of the majority of them and their selfless devotion to the great Leninist cause. We are proud of the fact that they have energy, initiative and a sense of daring in their creative search, and that they are beside us in all bold undertakings and are ready to successfully develop and continue these undertakings. We are proud of the parents who have brought their children up well and of the old comrades who have trained a reliable younger generation.

Speaking at a formal session in Tbilisi in 1982, which was dedicated to awarding the capital of Soviet Georgia the Order of Lenin, Comrade K. U. Chernenko said: "...Young people are the country's future. This is, of

course, true. But it is also true that young people already determine the face of our motherland in many ways today. This also applies to the republic's Komsomol, which was awarded the Order of Lenin in 1979. Shoulder to shoulder with communists and under their leadership, the Komsomol takes most active part in all the affairs of the republic. Yes, and not only of the republic alone."

A high appraisal. May it also henceforward serve as an incentive for new achievements by our glorious Komsomol and for new successes in the all-party, all-state and nationwide cause of the communist education of young people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/6

WORK SYSTEMATICALLY AND STRENUOUSLY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 37-48

[Article by N. Slyun'kov, CP of Belorussian Central Committee first secretary]

[Text.] The practical activities of the communist party--the political leader of Soviet society--are focused on the implementation of comprehensive and broad assignments related to perfecting developed socialism, strengthening the economic and defense power of the state and upgrading the well-being of the working people. Their implementation requires the total harnessing of forces and resources and further improving the quality of organizational-managerial activities in all socialist construction sectors.

A specific program for such work is found in the documents of the 26th Party Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums and their decrees, and the works and speeches of Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. The comprehensive and fruitful activities of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo are a model of its practical implementation and of the profoundly thought-out and comprehensively substantiated guidance of party and social life and application of a true Leninist work style.

All decisions and actions of the party and its leading bodies are based on the accurate knowledge of the basic laws and patterns of social progress and the skillful application of Marxist-Leninist theory in the study of specific reality. This enables us to get a clear idea of the future, properly to define the basic trends of socioeconomic and political development, to formulate mobilizing objectives and realistically to take into consideration the possibilities of attaining them.

One of the characteristic features in the party's revolutionary-transforming activities is the use of its systemic and comprehensive approach to the solution of the theoretical and practical problems of social life. This calls for enhancing the party's leading role as the political leader of society, broadening the scale and increasing the complexity of tasks related to communist construction and enhancing the social activeness of the masses.

The systematic approach is based on viewing party work as a comprehensive set of interrelated, interdependent and reciprocally supplementing ways, means and

methods aimed at resolving economic, sociopolitical and educational problems in their indissoluble unity.

The idea of system and integrity is embodied in the works and practical activities of V. I. Lenin, the creator of the communist party and Soviet state. He repeatedly pointed out the importance of "weighing the work system" and "detecting in each specific aspect the particular link in the chain which must be held with all of one's forces in order to hold together the entire chain and firmly prepare the transition to the next link" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 364; vol 36, p 205). The choice of the main link, as understood by Lenin, is the core of the systemic approach, which makes an accurate aim at the target possible. Without this, the main feature in the overall system of planned measures may be omitted, and more important tasks may be overshadowed by less significant ones.

Having firmly mastered the Leninist ideas of system, our party is developing and enriching them in the course of its daily constructive activities. The systemic approach used in all realms of social life is becoming increasingly widespread and the most important element in party and state construction. We speak of a "system of national economic planning," "system of material and technical support," "system of indicators," etc. Word combinations such as "acting systematically" and "ensuring a systematic approach" have been firmly established in the vocabulary of party, soviet and economic workers. Such terms are being encountered with increasing frequency in scientific publications and the press. Naturally, this is not a tribute to fickle fashion, although this too appears occasionally, but a reflection of the need to develop a methodology of scientific knowledge and social practice.

What is the essence of such an approach to party work? How do we understand it?

To work systematically means to be guided in all decisions and actions by the stipulations of Marxist-Leninist theory, to take the laws of social development into consideration, comprehensively to analyze occurring processes, phenomena and trends, always to set oneself strenuous, mobilizing yet realistic tasks and strive for their strict implementation.

To work systematically means to ensure the proper combination of party and state leadership, clearly to distinguish among the functions of party, soviet and economic organs and public organizations, to achieve high efficiency in their work and organization and coordination in reaching common objectives.

To work systematically means to ensure the close combination of organizational, economic and educational activities, the unbreakable unity between words and actions and decisions and executions and always to take into consideration the political, economic and sociomoral consequences of the totality of steps taken.

Guided by the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee, the Belorussian party organizations are directing their persistent efforts toward improving their work style and methods, promoting the systemic approach to the solution

of the problems facing the republic and mobilizing the masses for strenuous, creative and highly productive toil.

National economic management is the core of all communist party and Soviet state activities. As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, the foundations for resolving social problems, strengthening the country's capability and pursuing an active foreign policy lie precisely in the economic area.

National economic management is a complex and comprehensive matter. More than in any other area, here system and planning are required, without which reliable administration and economic management are inconceivable. Such were precisely the considerations of the CP of Belorussian Central Committee in elaborating and applying a system of basic trends in organizing the implementation of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress. In accordance with the main tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan, this short document defined the time and periodicity of implementation of specific organizational and political measures and stipulated who was to draft and implement them and supervise their execution.

To begin with, this system helps to ensure a more efficient organization in the activities of sectorial and territorial managing and administering bodies in resolving economic and social problems. Secondly, it helps to develop in the cadres the ability actively to control socioeconomic processes, to seek and set to work additional reserves for upgrading production efficiency and firmly to surmount departmentalism and parochialism. Thirdly, the system enables us to distribute functions and responsibilities among party, soviet and economic organs and to organize efficient control in all production sectors and management units, from top to bottom.

Let us trace the functioning of this system with specific examples borrowed from the practice of the party's guidance of the Belorussian economy. At the beginning of the five-year plan a paradoxical situation had developed in the republic: current annual plans were being fulfilled whereas the five-year assignment was being threatened with failure. Why? The point was that, proceeding from the still frequently limited resources, many union ministries and departments had lowered enterprise plans whereas republic bodies had failed to display the necessary principle-mindedness and consistency. Naturally, with less strenuous plans there was less concern and better guarantees for their implementation.

Naturally, the republic's communist party Central Committee could not tolerate this. Everything had to be analyzed and reckoned. It turned out that in order to ensure the guaranteed implementation of the five-year plan as a whole, the growth rates of industrial output had to be doubled in 1983 compared with previously planned figures.

But where to find and how to ensure such an increase? All of our organizational, economic and educational efforts were directed toward this task. A principle-minded analysis of shortcomings previously allowed in the formulation of the plans was made by the CP of Belorussia Central Committee; the activities of managers, who had tried to ease their burden were properly assessed. At the same time, specific assignments were formulated for the

individual oblasts. Central Committee secretaries and bureau members visited the obkoms; senior oblast personnel visited party gorkoms and raykoms and primary organizations. The situation had to be determined in literally every single enterprise, production sector and work place. In a word, solutions to the assignment were sought everywhere.

In accordance with the system developed in the republic, party, soviet and economic bodies assumed 10-day, monthly and quarterly supervision over the implementation of plans and obligations. We try to make such supervision preventive, emphasizing the need to notice negative trends promptly and to take specific efficient steps to exclude possible breakdowns in the implementation of the plans.

Nevertheless, should it turn out that some enterprises were unable to fulfill their plans, their individual cases are considered by the party's gorkoms, raykoms and obkoms and by ministries and departments. If necessary, specialists, who can study the situation on the spot and provide efficient aid, are assigned to the lagging enterprises.

Therefore, the art of mastering the systemic approach and to work strenuously and creatively is being studied by the cadres not in classrooms or at lectures but in the course of practical work. Such efforts alone, which demand the full dedication of forces, are truly fruitful. This is confirmed by results. During the first 3 years of the five-year plan the republic's volume of industrial output increased by 15.2 percent as compared to 13 percent as planned. Labor productivity increased by 10.2 percent rather than 8.8 percent as planned. Our industry is maintaining a good work rhythm this year as well. Socialist obligations for increasing labor productivity and lowering production costs are being overfulfilled. Conditions have been created for meeting the assignments of the entire five-year plan as a whole.

We also use the systemic approach in drafting the basic directions in the republic's economic and social development during the next five-year plan, firmly observing the stipulations set by Comrade K. U. Chernenko to the effect that during the 12th Five-Year Plan a radical turn toward upgrading the efficiency of the national economy must be achieved. The efforts of the republic's party organizations, labor collectives, ministries and departments are concentrated on seeking means of accelerating scientific and technical progress, increasing labor productivity and improving production quality. Let us point out that we have been able substantially to improve many previously planned technical and economic indicators.

Such an orientation toward systematic, strenuous and creative work equally marks the efforts of the republic party organization and all working people in the agroindustrial complex in the implementation of the Food Program. Here as well a major breakdown was allowed to occur in the republic at the beginning of the five-year plan and there was a substantial shortfall in the production of agricultural commodities. Naturally, this was also due to objective reasons, although not everything could be reduced to them. In the difficult weather conditions of the first years of the five-year plan, some managers on the rayon, oblast and even republic levels began to doubt the realistic nature of the assignments included in the Food Program and the possibility of meeting

them. The first thing which the personnel of the Central Committee and the party obkoms and raykoms had to do was to realize that the assignments were realistic and that they could and should be resolved. Then we had to convince of this anyone dealing with agricultural problems in the republic and its oblasts and rayons.

A comprehensive and profound study of all available reserves without exception had to be made and ways had to be found to catch up with the shortfall in agricultural commodities. We began by defining what individual farms, rayons and oblasts had to accomplish for the implementation of the Food Program. Particular attention was paid to economically weak farms. Let us point out that in recent years every second farm had worked unprofitably and many of them had become economically weak. Understandably, failure to deal with them meant failure to cope with planned assignments. A system of measures was formulated and implemented on the level of republic, oblast and rayon bodies and in each lagging kolkhoz and sovkhoz. This enabled all farms actively to join in the struggle for increasing the production and procurements of agricultural commodities. Each farm was assigned realistic growth targets. A set of corresponding organizational-technical and political education steps was drawn up for the planned indicators. We defined what each farm could and had to achieve by itself and within what period of time and the type of problems for which it needed the help of superior authorities.

The implementation of such measures was placed under strict party control. We are pleased to note that most of our cadres in the countryside showed a proper understanding of the requirements of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee. This yielded good results. In 1983 the number of losing farms declined from 1,145 to 64. The overall level of profitability increased from 8 to 30 percent. Naturally, increased state purchase prices of crop and animal husbandry goods played a positive role in this respect.

This year as well we are pleased by the results of the efforts of workers in fields and livestock farms. The potato crop averaged 180 quintals per hectare and the gross harvest was 12 percent higher compared to last year. A good crop of vegetables, animal feed and other crops was harvested. Milk and meat production increased. This enables the republic to fulfill its plans for the purchasing of all types of agricultural commodities and, for some of them, also substantially to compensate for previous shortfalls. Another very important fact is that our cadres gained valuable experience in doing systematic and specific work under all, including extreme, conditions, gained confidence in their strength, used the new opportunities and psyched themselves up for achieving even better results.

The decisions of the October 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which approved the long-term program for land reclamation and upgrading the efficiency of utilization of reclaimed land, provided a powerful impetus for further improvements in the work of the agroindustrial complex. This problem is of prime importance to the Belorussian SSR. We must continue to broaden the scale of reclamation and to improve its quality. Our main obligation, however, above all is radically to improve the productivity of already developed farmland of which we have a great deal--2.8 million hectares.

At the plenum our republic party organization was subjected to fully deserved criticism for low returns on reclaimed land. We drew proper conclusions. The recently held plenum of the Belorussian Central Committee approved specific steps to upgrade the fertility of each renovated hectare and to improve land reclamation. Today the solution of this problem is the main concern of party, soviet and agricultural bodies and all rural working people.

Lately some positive changes have taken place in the republic in major sectors, such as construction and transportation. A turn for the better has taken place in state trade and consumer services. These positive changes were achieved essentially as a result of comprehensive improvements in organizational and political work, and greater efficiency and performing discipline.

As we know, comparative studies are the most important component of the systemic approach. Comparisons reveal those who work better or worse. Opening a person's eyes about his work through the comparison method is the most intelligible and effective agitation method.

Our republic has six oblasts. Naturally, they operate under different natural and economic conditions and vary in terms of demographic features and level of development. We took as a basis for comparison the degree of utilization of available resources and possibilities and, in assessing activities of party, soviet and economic organs and all leading cadres, we proceed from what they could and should have been able to achieve as a result of full dedication.

This approach enabled us to determine, for example, that the results of agricultural production activities in Brest Oblast were by no means consistent with the tremendous aid given by the state and the substantial capital investments made in the oblast in recent years. The study indicated that, starting with 1975, the growth of capital investments here noticeably exceeded the average republic level. The excess was particularly significant in reclamation work. What were the results? Even during good years production output per hectare of reclaimed land remained low, within the range of 30 quintals of feed units. Animal husbandry developed slowly. The work shortfalls of the Brest comrades were particularly visible against the background of the creative and effective work of cadres in neighboring Grodno Oblast, which was competing with them.

The reasons for the contrasts, which were determined through comparative analysis, were discussed at a CP of Belorussian Central Committee Plenum. Let us point out that this helped the Brest people accurately to evaluate the existing situation and to draw practical conclusions from the criticism.

In the past similar claims had been addressed to the leadership of Minsk Oblast, where the existing production-economic potential had been underutilized as well. They were bluntly told that no objective reasons existed for marking time and that it was no longer admissible to work as they did. The Minsk area cadres properly reacted to the party's requirements and the situation in the oblast is currently improving.

Briefly, the elements of the systemic approach and comparative analysis are being increasingly applied in the party's management of the economy. Their advantage is that, on the one hand, they enable us to make a more objective assessment of cadres and, on the other, to develop in them a critical attitude toward their work style and to encourage them to think and act more energetically. In the final account, this cannot fail to influence overall work results.

We realize that the new work style which the CPSU Central Committee demands of us to master is not developed in the office. It must be learned in the course of real life, always seeking the advice of party organizations and local party members, testing through daily practical efforts the means and methods of organizational and political activities. Thus, in preparing for the CP of Belorussia Central Committee plenum on further improvements in the style of party work, we tried to sum up everything valuable in the experience of the party organization and to involve in a collective search for the most efficient methods of economic management education of people all leading cadres and the entire party aktiv.

The work style of party committees and primary party organizations and soviet and economic organs was profoundly analyzed on the eve of the plenum at conferences of the party obkoms, attended by CP of Belorussia Central Committee secretaries. Problems of improving the activities of the apparatus were discussed at party meetings held by the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, the Belorussian Council of Trade Unions, Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee and all republic ministries and departments. Meetings were held at the CP of Belorussia Central Committee with secretaries of primary party organizations, heads of enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes and republic ministries and departments and press workers. A broad and frank exchange of views took place. All remarks and suggestions were studied, summed up and taken into consideration in the plenum documents. Their implementation is having a positive impact on improving the activities of party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms. Of late the work of many of them has become more specific and efficient, and their approach to problems, more creative. In the set of measures taken for the party-political support of economic, social and educational tasks, we pay particular attention to upgrading the militancy of primary party organizations. The CP of Belorussia Central Committee Buro analyzes the various aspects of party organization activities at the Brest railroad junction, Construction Trust No 1 in Vitebsk, Beloruskaliy and Gorizont production associations, the petroleum refinery in Polotsk, and the Leninskiy Put' Kolkhoz, Slutskiy Rayon, we have tried, using them as an example, to show the other party organizations how to act under contemporary production conditions and how to improve their work style and methods in accordance with growing requirements.

Of late a major turn has been made toward strengthening and upgrading the militancy and prestige of primary party organizations of management bodies, which must safeguard the national interests firmly and uncompromisingly and intensify the efficiency of ministerial and departmental machineries persistently and consistently. It is precisely this aspect that the CP of Belorussia Central Committee has emphasized in reviewing the accountability reports submitted by the party organizations of the Belorussian SSR ministries

of food industry, agriculture, construction materials industry, motor transport and health.

A great deal is being done by the republic party organization to eliminate the fuss of meetings, unnecessary paper shuffling and armchair management. To this effect, the task was set of reducing the number of various conferences and meetings, which frequently create merely the appearance of active efforts while taking cadres away from concrete work with people. The assertion of the systemic approach greatly helps party, soviet and economic bodies to engage in long-term planning, to regulate the work of their apparatus and clearly to define the obligations of their personnel.

We are decisively rejecting unsuitable work methods according to which some economic managers submit to party bodies problems which they themselves should resolve. We qualify such actions as the desire to ensure oneself and to hide behind the party's reputation, should one have to assume responsibility for possible errors and shortcomings. On the other hand, we firmly correct party workers, who are under the thumb of such managers, becoming their petitioners and pushers for current economic problems and letting themselves be dragged into performing dispatcher and procurement functions. Our position in this matter is simple: everyone has his duties and everyone must assume full and undivided responsibility for the state of affairs in his assigned sector.

Steps are also being taken to put an end to the petty supervision of soviet and economic organs and public organizations. They are being granted greater autonomy and the opportunity to show initiative and creativity. The managerial personnel are asked to deal less with collecting and drafting various papers and to pay greater attention to live organizational work in the local areas. Some changes are already visible in this respect. The number of decisions, orders and other written directives has decreased noticeably in all ministries and departments. For example, in the past 2 years the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Agriculture and the Belorussian Interkolkhoz Construction Administration have reduced their correspondence with subordinate enterprises and organizations by two-thirds.

Improvements in the work style depend to a decisive degree on cadres. Cadre policy is one of the most important instruments in the party's active influence on all processes within society and a necessary prerequisite for the successful solution of the variety of problems relative to perfecting developed socialism. "An efficient thought-out system is important in work with cadres more than in any other area," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The elaboration of such a system, the strict observance of the Leninist principles of cadre policy and perfecting the mechanism itself of selecting, placing and training managers on all levels are the focal point of attention of the republic party organization.

In our work with cadres we rely on ensuring planned and systematic activities, seeing to it that all party committee activities are conducted on a broad democratic base and that all administrative and management sectors without exception are headed by politically mature and competent workers with high

moral qualities, enjoying a good reputation among the masses and able successfully to implement the party's policy.

The republic ascribes prime significance to work with party committee cadres. They are staffed by people who have been practically tested in various areas of production, science, culture and social activities. As a rule, one or even two secretaries in the absolute majority of our party gorkoms and raykoms are economic specialists and nearly one-half of such executives began their careers as workers and kolkhoz members. Most party committee secretaries have taken party-political training.

Through the efforts of the republic party organization a large combat-capable detachment of party, soviet and economic workers has been set up, distinguished by true efficiency and a truly innovative approach to the work. Famous kolkhoz leaders include Twice Heroes of Socialist Labor V. K. Starovoylov and V. A. Ral'ko, Heroes of Socialist Labor Ye. I. Kimstach and A. I. Dubko, talented industrial production organizers M. F. Lavrinovich, P. V. Zyl', A. P. Tarakin and V. A. Ivanov and others.

Many republic party committees are skillfully working with cadres. In the Minsk City Party Organization, for example, such work is based on long-term plans which call for a differentiated approach to the various worker and specialist categories. As required by the systemic approach, here the cadres are studied and assessed above all on the basis of specific results, always keeping track of promising workers, helping them to grow and improve, and taking their capabilities and inclinations into consideration. The party gorkom and raykoms closely listen to the opinion of the primary party organizations and labor collectives. It is precisely within the labor collective that the practical behavior of a manager, his attitude toward the people and his ability to rely on the collective and to support the initiative of subordinates are manifested most clearly.

In our efforts to improve work with cadres, we pay particular attention to developing their high moral and political qualities, the significance of which immeasurably increases under contemporary conditions. The most important qualities which a manager at any level or of any rank in any area of activity must have are to be honest and truthful to the party, the state and people. The party organs firmly get rid of those who abuse their official position, take the path of account padding and whitewashing, show disrespect for the people and practice bureaucracy and red tape.

It has become the rule of party committees and organizations in the republic to discuss reports submitted by managers, who are party members, on their implementation of statutory and official duties and party decisions and assignments. In recent years a work method such as having talks with cadres, has proved its usefulness. At the CP of Belorussia Central Committee such talks take place with secretaries of party committees, chairmen of oblast executive committees and heads of republic ministries and departments, particularly those who have been criticized. The same method is practiced by party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms. Regularly and no less than once a year, sessions are held by the party obkom, gorkom and raykom bureaus with the participation of secretaries and other personnel of superior party bodies, at

which the work of one party committee or another and its leadership is analyzed frankly and on a principle-minded basis.

The system of leading cadre training is being perfected. New methods have appeared alongside the traditional and tried forms of retraining personnel and upgrading their skills. In particular, the CP of Belorussian Central Committee has organized short courses for elected first secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms and chairmen of executive committees of city and rayon soviets; similar courses have been organized by the CP of Belorussia obkoms for secretaries of primary party organizations and chairmen of executive committees of rural and settlement soviets. The theory and practice of party and soviet construction, ideological work and party management of the economy are studied at such courses. In addition to lectures, they offer practical training on a strictly differentiated basis, taking into consideration the specific features of the individual student categories. The students are addressed by secretaries and heads of Central Committee departments and party obkoms. Practical training by cadres is another form of work of confirmed usefulness.

In a word, a great deal is being done. This, however, does not mean that no shortcomings or unresolved problems exist. Not all party committees work with cadres on a planned and systematic basis, always displaying strict exigency toward managers for the efficient and conscientious implementation of their obligations. The necessary cadre stability, combined with the steady influx of fresh and young forces, has not been secured everywhere. Few women are still being promoted to leading positions. A great deal of formalism exists in developing a cadre reserve: here and there such reserves exist on paper only and should the need appear to find a capable person to assume one position or another, occasionally this proves to be difficult. We are aware of these and some other omissions and are persistently working to correct them.

The novelty and complexity of the problems which are being resolved in the course of perfecting developed socialism and the higher educational level and cultural standards attained by the people increase the requirements which face the managers and their practical and ideological-moral features. This thought was particularly emphasized at the recently held CPSU Central Committee Politburo session, which discussed the suggestions submitted by K. U. Chernenko on some problems of contemporary cadre policy. In accordance with these instructions, the republic is taking comprehensive measures to ensure the strict observance of the Leninist principles of cadre policy and the strict implementation of party requirements governing the selection, placement and upbringing of cadres and increasing their responsibility for assignments. All of this helps us to implement the most important Leninist behest more successfully: "...To organize the choice of the best workers on a broad, planned, systematic and open basis...." (op. cit., vol 43, p 280).

In perfecting the entire system of work with cadres we show tireless concern for improving the organization of control and verification of execution. We see to it that every manager is always aware of his accountability and responsibility not only to his superiors but to his subordinates as well and assess his actions and steps self-critically. The party organizations are

persistently trying to make control exigent and profound, conducted on a planned, systematic and efficient basis, simultaneously from the top and the bottom. Today no single CP of Belorussia Central Committee Buro decree is approved without a work plan containing specific organizational steps for its implementation. The same approach is being asserted in the party's obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms.

Problems related to verifying the implementation of decisions are regularly discussed by party committees and primary organizations. Thus, the reports submitted by the Grodno city party committee and the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Culture on the implementation of the resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and communications submitted by the Belorussian SSR Gosplan, Ministry of Industrial Construction, Goskomsel'khoshtekhnika, Ministry of Rural Construction and Ministry of the Meat and Dairy Industry on reacting to critical remarks and suggestions expressed at the 29th Communist Party of Belorussia Congress, subsequent Central Committee plenums and the accountability and election campaign in the republic's party organizations, were recently discussed at CP of Belorussia Central Committee plenums.

In the course of control activities considerable attention is paid also to upgrading the role of the Central Committee secretariat and the republic's communist party obkoms. As a result of the thorough study of the work of obkom secretariats in this respect, a number of major shortcomings and omissions were brought to light. On the instruction of the CP of Belorussia Central Committee Buro, the party obkoms took steps for their elimination. We can note with satisfaction that the party committees have begun to pay greater attention to control and verification of execution of party and government decisions and their own decrees. This type of problem accounts today for more than 65 percent of the items discussed by the secretariats of the Central Committee and CP of Belorussia obkoms. Personal verification of execution is particularly emphasized. The party workers visit labor collectives more frequently and combine more fully control with specific aid to local cadres. In the majority of cases, this work is done on a current and planned basis involving the participation of a broad circle of the party aktiv and specialists.

However, a number of unfinished problems exist in this area as well. In frequent cases managers report not the actual implementation of decisions, assignments and obligations but all sorts of plans, steps and requests. Occasionally, numerous commissions from different departments investigate the same matter. In order to eliminate parallelism and duplication and to enhance control efficiency, republic, oblast and rayon councils were set up to coordinate the activities of party commissions, people's control bodies and permanent commissions of soviets of people's deputies and trade union and other public organizations.

While persistently improving our work on the verification of execution, we keep reminding our cadres that control means above all work with the people. Practical experience proves the great importance of the skillful approach, which must be strict and exigent but also sympathetic. Comrade K. U. Chernenko paid particular attention to this aspect of the matter in his speech at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers.

The principles of comprehensiveness and systematic approach are being increasingly implied in ideological and political education work. A great deal has been and is being done in the republic to enhance the effectiveness of the work of ideological institutions and ideological and propaganda cadres in the light of the requirements of the 26th Party Congress and the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. A broad party aktiv and the majority of economic managers and specialists have been recruited to participate in ideological work. Cooperation among party committees and scientific institutions and higher educational establishments is strengthening in the study of topical problems of communist education. An organizational system for ideological education is being developed in labor collectives and places of residence and interaction among the various means of oral propaganda and agitation is strengthening.

Single-policy days, addresses by information-propaganda groups and open-letter days have firmly become part of mass-political activities in recent years. The scale of such work may be judged by the following data: more than 17,000 reporters participate in the monthly single-policy day which rallied an audience of 1.5 million people. Some 11,000 management workers are members of the information-propaganda groups of party committees. Heads of republic ministries and departments periodically submit practical reports in the press and on the television and radio, answering questions asked by working people. Workers in the service industry submit regular reports in settlements and microrayons and labor collectives.

In July 1984, for example, trade workers submitted reports in labor collectives and places of residence. More than 9,000 questions and suggestions were formulated at those meetings. Many of them were answered immediately and some are being processed by republic, oblast, city and rayon bodies. Similar-type reports were submitted to the working people by personnel in transportation and health care. The results of such work are considered by Central Committee departments and collegiums of ministries and departments. This helps to resolve urgent problems and to improve the activities of consumer service sectors.

The most important distinguishing feature of the systemic approach in ideological-political work is its close connection with the practice and the struggle for the implementation of socioeconomic tasks and national economic plans. We direct the party organizations and all of our cadres toward systematic observance of the Leninist principle of unity among ideological, economic and organizational activities.

The republic has gained adequate experience in ensuring such unity. Thus, the party organizations in Nesvizhskiy Rayon, Minsk Oblast, clearly define the range of topical economic, social and educational problems and the place and role which managers and specialists, public organizations and ideological subdivisions play in their solution and skillfully coordinate their work.

The party committee of the Stommashina Plant imeni 50-Letiya Volikogo Oktyabrya in Mogilev is doing purposeful work in this direction. Its party committee, which rallies and coordinates the organizational and educational

efforts of the administration and the party, trade union and other public organizations and labor collectives at all stages, ranging from the formulation of plans to supervising their implementation, always sees to it that in the course of resolving production problems ideological and economic activities are closely interwoven. It promotes unity of action which excludes duplication and parallelism in the work. Such practices have a positive effect on upgrading the social activeness of the working people and on creating a healthy businesslike atmosphere in the collectives.

The efficient coordination of the efforts of party committee departments and not only formulating organizational-technical and economic measures but providing party-political support of formulated plans play an important role in the assertion of the systemic approach and ensuring unity among organizational, economic and ideological activities. It is precisely in this key, for example, that the application of brigade forms of labor organization and incentive takes place. How specifically do the CP of Belorussia Central Committee departments coordinate this work?

The sectorial departments ensure the practical organization of cost accounting contracting collectives and the creation of the material, economic and legal prerequisites for their normal functioning. The organizational-party work department helps to strengthen the brigades with cadres and to enhance the party's influence within them. The ideological departments apply systems of ideological education measures, organize economic training, sum up and disseminate progressive experience and publicize results of the socialist competition.

The party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms have organized their work in precisely the same manner. The CP of Belorussia Central Committee directs them not only toward the unification of their efforts but also toward ensuring the closer interaction with soviet and economic organs and trade union, Komsomol and other public organizations.

This yields tangible results. The new forms of labor organization and incentive cover more than 70 percent of all workers in industry and about 60 percent of workers in construction in the republic.

The party organizations strengthen the ties between ideological work and the implementation of economic and sociopolitical tasks and update the topics covered in Marxist-Leninist training and economic education and all forms of propaganda and agitation. The party committee workers are doing a great deal to provide specific aid to secretaries of primary party organizations and to the primary agitation-propaganda aktiv in organizing the education process.

Nevertheless, many party committees and organizations are still not observing the stipulations of a systematic approach to ideological work with adequate consistency. At one of its sessions the Central Committee Buro criticized the Kalinkovichi Party Gorkom for major shortcomings in the work on ideological-political training of leading cadres and specialists and enhancing their role in the upbringing of the working people. From the formal viewpoint everything necessary seemed to have been done. Managers and specialists attended political and professional training courses and worked as lecturers,

propagandists and political reporters. Frequently, however, their work had nothing to do with life or practical problems. The gap between words and actions could not fail to affect results of economic activities. The rayon began to surrender one position after another, in agricultural production in particular. To the honor of the Kalinkovichi comrades, they drew practical conclusions from the criticism. Their work is showing substantial improvements.

We cannot fail to be concerned by the fact that so far not all party committees and first secretaries make profound studies of the state of political education. Occasionally, in assessing economic activities political, ideological and educational factors are ignored. In other words, the party committees and organizations must do a great deal more entirely to outlive formalism in ideological work and ensure a permanent and efficient tie between agitation and propaganda, on the one hand, and the life and specific affairs of collectives and topical problems affecting the people, on the other.

The 11th Five-Year Plan is nearing its end. At its present stage, which is particularly important, when the party is preparing for its 27th congress, it is very important to interpret and assess the accumulated experience, draw lessons from errors and shortcomings and earmark means of their elimination. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized at the 15 November 1984 CPSU Central Committee Politburo session, we must systematically analyze the state of affairs in the economy of every region and enterprise and skillfully engage in a continuing search for optimal solutions of urgent problems. Timely and substantiated actions and organizational and propaganda steps must become a mandatory law governing the activities of party activists and soviet and economic organs.

On the basis of our accomplishments, creatively enriching them and systematically working most strenuously, the Belorussian party organization is harnessing the efforts of party members and all working people for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the assignments of the 11th Five-Year Plan and for a worthy welcome of the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory and the next 27th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL FOUNDATION OF THE AGROINDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 49-60

[Article by VASKHNIL Corresponding Member Yu. Konkin]

[Text] In considering the reserves of the agrarian economy, the All-Union Economic Conference on Problems of the Agroindustrial Complex directed workers in science and production toward upgrading the efficiency of the utilization of the material and technical base established in agriculture. In his speech, Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, emphasized the need to improve the economic mechanism, to upgrade the level of economic thinking of our cadres and to improve organizational management methods for the implementation of the USSR Food Program--the most important component of the party's economic strategy.

I

The Food Program calls for the proportional and balanced development of the agroindustrial complex, improving management, planning and economic incentive in all of its sectors, maximal orientation toward planned end results, ensuring high rates of development of agricultural output on the basis of its systematic intensification, comprehensive strengthening of the material and technical base and improving the utilization of production and technical potential. At the present stage, the basic directions of the party's agrarian policy and their specific manifestation in the Food Program and the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On the Long-Term Program for Reclamation and Upgrading the Efficient Utilization of Reclaimed Land With a View to the Stable Growth of the Country's Food Stock," are aimed at creating a scientifically substantiated and necessary food stock to meet the growing requirements of the population. The kolkhozes and sovkhoses--the main link in the agroindustrial complex--play a decisive role in upgrading the production of agricultural commodities.

The unquestionable successes achieved in the development of agricultural production proved the vitality of kolkhozes and sovkhoses as the basic agricultural enterprises and the possibility of their development as the main unit in the agroindustrial complex. However, kolkhoz and sovkhos successes could have been greater had the proportionality of balance in the development of all enterprises within the agroindustrial complex been observed and had an

equivalent exchange among them been secured on the basis of a stably operating economic management mechanism, the steady perfecting of which must take place with the development of production forces and their corresponding production relations.

As was pointed out at the All-Union Economic Conference, the rural working people have voiced many complaints about the quality of work of their partners and the high cost of services.

The steps taken to improve the economic mechanism in farm management and strengthening the kolkhoz and sovkhos economy, adopted at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, stipulate an increase in purchase prices as of 1983 and markups for goods supplied to the state by underprofitable or losing kolkhozes and sovkhoses, totaling 16 billion rubles per year.

The economic indicators of kolkhoz and sovkhos activities improved as early as 1983: profits, not taking higher purchase prices and markups into consideration, increased by 7.4 billion rubles, totaling 23.6 billion. All of this proves the timeliness and great effectiveness of the steps taken by the party and the government for the development of agriculture.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree on the long-term reclamation program calls for "developing and ratifying norms in 1985 for ensuring kolkhozes and sovkhoses with tractors, trucks, soil cultivation and harvesting machines needed for growing farm crops on the basis of programmed harvests."

This is a qualitatively new level in the development of agricultural production. Crop programming depends on material facilities, agricultural machine building above all.

Currently, there are 2.7 million tractors and 794,000 grain-harvesting combines operating in agriculture. The power of tractor, combine and motor vehicle engines (524.7 million horsepower) exceeds the capacity of the country's electric power plants by a factor of more than 1.3. A widespread repair-servicing base is operating in the countryside, consisting of nearly 400 repair plants and networks of specialized repair enterprises within the system of the USSR Goskomsel'khoztekhnika and kolkhoz and sovkhos repair workshops.

With the addition of equipment, as stipulated by the USSR Food Program, by 1990 energy-generating capacities in kolkhozes and sovkhoses will be increased by a factor of 1.6. Scientific and technical progress in capital-producing sectors ensures the strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture and creates conditions for completing in its essential lines the comprehensive mechanization of crop growing and animal husbandry by 1990. Complex and power-intensive operations, such as plowing, grain crop, cotton and sugar beet sowing and grain and silage crop harvesting, are already entirely mechanized. Supplying machinery for the total mechanization of potato sowing, inter-row cultivation of sugar beets, corn and cotton, and for many other technological operations, is almost completed. Hay and straw stacking, vegetable planting, flax pulling and sugar beet harvesting with

combines have reached an 85-95 percent mechanization level. A great deal remains to be done to raise the level of mechanization of potato and cotton harvesting and perfecting machines and mechanisms performing other technological operations.

The level and pace of completion of comprehensive mechanization greatly depend on observing the respective proportions in supplying agriculture with equipment and improving the quality of technical facilities and their highly productive utilization. The prompt renovation of equipment and replacing old, less productive with new, highly efficient equipment ensures the steady lowering of production outlays for agricultural commodities. Energetic measures have been taken in recent years to upgrade the effective utilization of power-saturated tractors by creating and supplying them with corresponding sets of agricultural machinery.

The leading role of industry can be clearly traced in agricultural industrialization, not only in the creation of modern, highly efficient and reliable equipment but also in the proportional development of the corresponding repair-servicing base, which enables us to maintain this equipment in working condition for the stipulated service life and supplying it with spare parts on the basis of technically substantiated norms. Huge material-technical and manpower resources are invested in the production and repair of contemporary machines, the sensible utilization of which depends on the reciprocal interest shown by the manufacturers of the equipment and enterprises which ensure its operation, technical servicing and repairs. Their interaction must be based on economic principles which guarantee the national economic efficiency of the steps earmarked by the party and the government for the implementation of the USSR Food Program on the basis of the rational utilization of APK [agroindustrial complexes] production potential.

The significance of the steps taken for economic control and material and technical supplies, aimed at strengthening the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy, would be difficult to overestimate. They are possible only in a country in which national economic interests and the interests of individual enterprises obey the single objective of upgrading the well-being of the entire Soviet people.

One of the functions of the economic mechanism is to ensure the steady equivalent exchange and equal opportunities for expanded reproduction for all enterprises within the agroindustrial complex. "The main feature," noted M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, "is the creation of the type of economic mechanism which is able to maintain price parity in intersectorial and intrasectorial trade and ensure kolkhoz and sovkhoz production profitability on a level equal to that in other material production sectors."

The Food Program calls for improving economic relations between agriculture and the other economic sectors, with a view to expanded reproduction in kolkhozes and sovkhozes, upgrading material responsibility and increasing the interest of service enterprises and organizations in the quality of services and, eventually, end results of farm production activities.

The establishment of a system of stable and economically substantiated production relations between kolkhozes and sovkhoses and their APK partners is a lengthy and continually developing process. Naturally, as experience in reciprocal APK operations is gained, the partners find and will continue to find solutions, ever more accurate and more fully consistent with their reciprocal interests. A great deal has been done in this respect although occasionally the common interest in resolving problems of upgrading the efficiency of the utilization of the production potential created within the APK is weakened by a departmental approach. Some new and more productive machines are becoming more expensive and the cost of maintaining them in operating condition rises faster than the productivity, reliability and durability of the equipment and its efficiency. Machine builders and repair workers quite legitimately blame the users of the equipment for violating handling and maintenance regulations. The kolkhoz and sovkhos engineering services have no less substantiated claims, backed by daily occurrences, regarding the quality of machines, machine units and spare parts they receive and the quality of equipment repairs and servicing.

The quality of the equipment has significantly improved in recent years. However, such improvements have fluctuated: the initial indicators of the technical and economic characteristics of the machines sharply worsen after 3-4 years of use. According to USSR Central Statistical Administration data, 1981 K-700 tractors worked 206 days in 1982; 1979 tractors worked 183 days and 1976 tractors, 152 days. The cost of maintaining them in working condition increased in accordance with their age from 1,830 rubles per 1981 tractor to 2,631 rubles per 1979 tractor.

The question of the study of agriculture as a large consumer of industrial commodities, with the full right to determine not only the variety and quantity of measured equipment but its quality as well, determining subsequent costs to the consumer in the course of the utilization of the machinery, is still rarely and timidly discussed in economic publications. Serious preparations must be made for the time when the need for agricultural equipment will be basically met and the consumer will acquire the possibility of choosing machines in accordance with their quality and price, and express his preference for some models or others.

K. Marx pointed out that "since the commodity is purchased by the customer not because of value but because of "consumer value" and is used for specific purposes, it is self-evident that (1) consumer values are "rated," i.e., their quality is studied (in precisely the same way that their quantity is measured, weighed, etc.); (2) that when various types of commodities become interchangeable, preference is given to one variety or another, and so on and so forth" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 387).

Under the conditions of the planned delivery to agriculture of new equipment we must engage in a more extensive economic substantiation of the expediency of one machine or machine set or another at the designing stage, forecasting not only the technical parameters but their economical nature and possibility of significantly increasing labor productivity and lowering production costs in its utilization.

The question of the economic assessment of the quality of new equipment and its efficient servicing and repairs has become crucial at the contemporary stage in the development of the agroindustrial complex, mainly because the level of equipment availability in agricultural production is increasing sharply and, secondly, because the task of the economical utilization of the huge technical and labor resources of the countryside is closely related to the quality of goods and services.

The closest possible attention should be paid to the consideration, study and substantiation of criteria used in assessing the quality of new and repaired equipment, for it is essentially this which governs the methodological approach to the overall solution of the problem of agricultural equipment reproduction at the contemporary stage of scientific and technical progress.

Technical progress is a comprehensive multiple-tiered phenomenon implemented, to say the least, in the technical advantages offered by new machines and equipment, the economic effectiveness of their utilization and the social consequences of production industrialization. In this connection, the comprehensive approach to assessing the quality of new and repaired equipment presumes the use of technical, economic and social indicators of its quality.

A significant increase in the unit power of engines, the enhanced power saturation of tractors and combines and the increased work speeds of machine-tractor units has been noted in recent decades. Whereas in 1965 agriculture used tractors the engines averaging 48 horsepower, the average power of a tractor engine reached 75 horsepower by 1980, i.e., it increased by more than one-half. In 1983 agriculture was supplied with 373,000 tractors totaling 32 million horsepower. In other words, the average tractor power exceeded 85 horsepower.

The handling capacity of grain-harvesting combines and the range and technical productivity of many other types of agricultural machinery are increasing significantly.

As to the reliability, durability and repair suitability of agricultural equipment, so far such indicators are still improving too slowly, although the Food Program stipulates that the machine-building industry must "steadily upgrade the technical standard, quality and, particularly, reliability of tractors, combines, machines and equipment for crop growing, animal husbandry and feed production and food industry sectors."

The quality of some models of tractors, combines and agricultural machines does not completely meet modern requirements. The productivity of many machines is low and their further assembling and tuning is highly labor-intensive; they are insufficiently well-adapted for repairs and technical servicing which require substantial additional labor and material outlays in the course of their exploitation.

Regardless of the number of technical indicators, from this viewpoint, although they may characterize a specific machine, such characterization is one-sided and by no means complete and comprehensive. The quality of a machine, which is a labor tool for industrial use, must be defined on the basis of economic indicators.

Uniform accountability principles, mandatory for all national economic sectors, have been formulated in accordance with the method for determining the efficiency of new equipment. They stipulate that the annual economic results of their use is the sum of the economy of all production resources in terms of labor, materials and capital investments, obtained by the national economy as a result of its manufacturing and utilization. The very concept of "new equipment" is defined through technological, economic and social parameters. From the economic viewpoint, equipment can be considered new only when the overall cost of its acquisition, repair and exploitation, related to the volume of useful work during its service life, is lower than that of the replaced equipment. The universality of this criterion allows us to extend it to the individual stages of equipment utilization during its service life and, by making the stage-by-stage comparison of reduced annual outlays possible, to establish the length of the effective utilization of the machine, i.e., the optimal period at the conclusion of which the fleet must be updated and a given machine must be replaced by another of the same or more effective model.

In other words, if the total outlays related to the volume of accomplished work are not reduced in the course of utilization or even begin to increase, the further use of a specific machine must be terminated, for such equipment becomes costly and soon afterwards begins to generate losses. Such losses are explained not only by the high initial cost of the machine but the operational expenditures which increase with the aging of the machine.

The cost of agricultural equipment has increased significantly. Thus, the initial cost of tractors used for the same purpose and of the same traction class doubled over a 30-year period. DT-54 tractors cost 1,782 rubles in 1950 and 2,336 in 1969. The initial cost of the T-74, DT-75 and DT-75M tractors which replaced them was, respectively, 2,565, 3,525 and 3,890 rubles.

The technical qualities of the new tractors increased significantly. The unattractive profession of equipment hitcher vanished and the work of the tractor driver became easier. Naturally, the cost of industry in developing more advanced machines increased. On this basis, higher costs must be considered a natural phenomenon which reflects more complicated designs, greater comfort and better safety conditions for machine handlers, consistent with ergonomic requirements and the aesthetic features of contemporary machinery.

K. Marx wrote that "as machines leave the period of their youth behind and to the extent to which they become different from the dimensions and nature of the tool of the artisan which they initially replace, they become larger and more expensive. They require more working time for their manufacturing and their absolute cost increases, although, relatively speaking, they become less expensive" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 47, p 357). Although the initial cost of new equipment is higher, the machinery must become relatively

less expensive per unit of useful work or produced commodities. However, the cost of tractor technical servicing and repairs has even increased despite virtually unchanged annual earnings and amount of work for the period of amortization. Thus, for example, the output of a DT-54 tractor for an 8-year period was 9,271 hectares of conventional plowing in 1969 and the sum of the initial cost and the cost of repairs and technical servicing did not exceed 8,000 rubles for that time. In 1983 DT-75 and DT-75M tractors had cultivated 8,076 hectares over an 8-year period; their initial cost and servicing and repair outlays were, respectively, 11,324 and 12,226 rubles.

Outlays per unit of useful work were 0.96 rubles per hectare for DT-54 tractors in 1969; in 1983 they averaged 1.41 rubles per DT-75 tractor and 1.51 rubles per hectare per DT-75M tractor.

Machine design and durability of factory adjustments are such that in order to maintain tractors in working condition, over a service life of 8-10 years, the cost of repairs and technical servicing is double the cost of a new tractor. Thus, for each ruble spent in purchasing a new K-700, DT-75 or T-150 tractor, the consumer spends 2.1 rubles for its use; the cost per Belarus' tractor is 1.9 rubles. Spare parts account for between 40 and 50 percent of such costs.

Such a significant increase in wholesale prices of tractor and tractor engine capital repairs was the reason for increased consumer outlays for maintaining the equipment in working conditions and for the reduced economic efficiency of its utilization, for the quality of repairs and the interval between repairs have remained essentially unchanged.

The incentive mechanism must be directed toward the production not only of power-saturated highly productive equipment, but equipment which will require an economical use of manpower, fuel, spare parts and repair materials, will contribute to the least pollution of the environment and will ensure the preservation of soil fertility.

Taking into consideration the seasonal nature of agricultural production, it becomes more profitable to purchase more expensive and reliable machinery than to lose time, effort and materials to repair inexpensive but less reliable equipment during intensive periods of work in the fields.

Along with upgrading engine resources to 8,000-10,000 motor hours, it would be expedient in the development of new tractors to reduce subsequent costs of maintaining the machinery in working condition by a factor of 1.5-2, and substantially to reduce the labor-intensiveness of technical servicing and repairs which, in the case of modern tractors and combines, exceeds manufacturing labor-intensiveness by several hundred percent.

With a view to creating conditions for the efficient utilization of equipment in kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the machine builders must significantly lower consumer outlays for maintaining the machines in working condition and reduce agriculture's needs for spare parts (and, subsequently, their consumption) by upgrading reliability, durability and repair ease.

Upgrading equipment reliability is more important than expanding repair-servicing facilities in agriculture, the production capacity of which must expand both as a result of the expanded machine-tractor fleet and the insufficiently adequate quality of machine manufacturing, repair and servicing.

Increasing the price of machines as a result of their increased reliability and durability would be expedient for agriculture, providing that subsequent outlays related to technical servicing and repairs are lowered. The main requirement is for the growth rates of the efficiency of the new equipment (and not productivity alone) to outstrip the growth rates of equipment prices. The observance of this stipulation will ensure a reduction in the production costs of mechanized work and commodity output.

III

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Perfecting Economic Relations Between Agriculture and the Other National Economic Sectors" stipulates a set of measures for ensuring economic conditions for expanded reproduction in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The preservation and development of means of production and equipment, as their most important component, are among the most important prerequisites for expanded reproduction in agriculture.

Unfortunately, the economic process of preserving and expanding material and technical facilities in the countryside takes place under circumstances considered by no means optimal. The amortization fund, as the economic base of the timely renovation of equipment, was and still is set with significant violations of theoretical requirements which call for the accumulation of funds for renovation to an extent equaling the initial cost of capital assets for the period of their functioning. In other words, the size of the amortization fund should not be superior or inferior to the initial cost of the amortized capital assets.

A procedure for computing amortizations on the basis of a steady annual norm in percent of the initial value of the equipment was instituted in 1963. The amortization was computed for the period during which the machine was included in the enterprise's balance sheet, even if amortization withholdings covering its entire initial value had already been made. This procedure, which initially seemed advantageous for the entire agricultural sector, in the course of which substantially bigger funds were withheld for the amortization fund compared to the cost of agricultural equipment, not only failed to provide economical conditions for expanded reproduction of machines in the farms but was also used as an economic lever for writing off suitable yet already amortized equipment. According to the instructions, the farms continued to set aside amortization funds and to pay for assets although the initial cost of the machine had already been amortized. The surplus amortization funds increased production costs; the aged machinery required higher repair and technical servicing outlays; the reduced reliability and increased idling for technical reasons did not contribute to retaining skilled mechanizer cadres. Two years later (by 1965) the imperfections of the 1963 amortization system became apparent. The continuing amortization, past the

amortization deadline, became an obstacle to the efficient utilization of a considerable share of economically amortized but still usable machinery.

The suggestion which was made in 1965 of ending the amortization of machines whose initial cost had been amortized, was discussed for the following 15 years. Finally, experimentally as of 1977 and comprehensively starting with 1982, it became mandatory. The stipulation which banned writing off machines which had not been used during the stipulated amortization period helped to reduce the amount of ahead-of-schedule writeoffs.

However, some farms continue to allow the premature writing off of equipment. This not only reduces the service life of machines but lowers the economic possibilities of reproduction of the machine-tractor fleet. Thus, in 1981 the Put' k Kommunizmu Kolkhoz in Mtsenskiy Rayon, Orel Oblast, prematurely wrote off 38 pieces of machinery, including three tractors and two grain combines. Chikskiy Sovkhoz, Novosibirsk Oblast, prematurely wrote off eight caterpillar tractors, falling short 8,300 rubles in amortization withholdings. Every year kolkhozes and sovkhozes prematurely write off a considerable percentage of tractors and farm machinery. All the necessary steps must be taken to prevent such premature writeoffs. This directive must be supported by economic steps which will include increasing the amortization withholdings to the level of the initial cost of the machinery, in order not only to create the necessary economic conditions for the accumulation of an amortization fund equaling the initial cost of written-off machinery but also to include in production costs for the current year that same share of production costs. The reasonable combination of economic with legal steps would make the farms interested in the efficient use of the equipment.

At the present time farms frequently use state loans for purchasing equipment, for the economic incentives for the creation of their own amortization fund are not fully effective. State funds are being extensively used for purposes which could be achieved through the enterprise amortization fund. According to Marx, this is a fund "accumulated for purposes of expanded recapitalization" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 30, p 231).

The socialist state has incomparably greater possibilities of using the amortization fund for expanding output. It regulates its accumulation in accordance with the actual needs for technical retooling of agriculture, without resorting to state credits for such purposes.

It would be expedient to undertake economic experiments on the use of accelerated amortization methods, which will make it possible intensively to accumulate funds during the initial years of machine utilization and reduce amortization withholdings in the final years, when the machines have become less efficient. Accelerated amortization is more consistent with the nature of the wearing off of contemporary machinery than the proportional method currently used.

The occasionally expressed views that accelerated amortization would increase the cost of agricultural commodities and reduce profitability are groundless, for regardless of the amortization method, it is only the initial cost of the machine which is amortized and the overall amount of amortizations applied to

commodity output does not change. The amortization fund is used to finance equipment capital repairs. "Repair operations, etc., to the extent to which they are needed, are added to the initial machine cost" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 25, part I, p 92).

Equipment repairs play a special role in the expanded reproduction system, ensuring the normal functioning of contemporary labor tools over optimal lengths of service life. We can neither belittle nor exaggerate the importance of repairs. The periodical outbreaks of polemics, in the course of which some authors consider repairs to be forced as a result of equipment shortages, whereas others speak (but not prove) of the need to extend service life by increasing the number of repairs do not result in a commonly shared opinion because of the lack of criteria in assessing the economic expedience of repairs. Repairs are expedient within the limits of the stipulated machine life.

The annual cost of servicing and repairing agricultural equipment is about 7 billion rubles. We must ensure the thrifty and efficient utilization of such funds above all by upgrading repair quality. The contemporary agricultural machinery repair and rebuilding industry is concentrated mainly within the system of the USSR Goskomsel'khoztekhnika, which has a widespread network of repair plants and specialized workshops which carry out the most difficult and labor-intensive capital repairs of machines and machine units and rebuild parts.

State standards regulate the original life of tractors to be between 6,000 and 8,000 motor-hours, which averages 5-7 years of use and post-repair tractor life to be no less than 80 percent of new equipment. Selective studies conducted in the farms of the Nonchernozem Zone in the RSFSR indicated that the average life of a DT-75 tractor is 3,960 average hectares (3.4 years) before the first repair, and 1,750 hectares (1.75 years) for a repaired tractor.

Another of the many technical and organizational reasons for which the stipulated standard life of new and repaired machinery cannot be secured is economic. The existing economic mechanism is not entirely aimed at upgrading the quality of equipment repairs. The standard equipment repair prices, regardless of the level of wear and residual value of repaired machinery, encouraged sovkhoses and kolkhoses to use the equipment to the limit. It may appear on the surface that the longer the period before repairs is, the more efficient and inexpensive equipment use becomes: the cost of repairs made at Goskomsel'khoztekhnika enterprises is steady and based on price lists. This, however, is on the surface only. In reality, the enterprises are allocated repair funds for machines the rebuilding of which is much more costly, due to their misuse, assuming, to begin with, that such costs are within the range of the price list and could ensure the profitable work of the repair enterprise. This conflicting situation is resolved by violating repair technology and making incomplete repairs. Naturally, this lowers repair quality.

The cost of machine repairs must be related to the residual value of the repaired equipment and the quality of repairs. This condition can be met in practice by converting from sending machines to be repaired to purchasing and

selling kolkhoz and sovkhos machinery needing repairs at prices based on the degree of wear and the residual value of machines needing repairs. The repaired equipment should be rated according to quality categories. In the case of tractors, for example, quality can be fully established by post-repair life, according to which the price of the repaired machine can be set. It would be better substantiated to assess the activities of repair enterprises by additionally evaluating the total life of their output and subsequent consumer outlays in the use of this life, i.e., on the basis of the volume of output, but also mandatorily in accordance with its quality.

The complex and expensive equipment supplied to the countryside must be used, serviced and stored knowledgeably. The cost of keeping a K-700 tractor idle is much more substantial than that of tractors produced in previous decades. Expensive and highly effective machines frequently remain idle for lack of relatively inexpensive parts.

The unsolved problem of spare parts adversely affects the keeping of mechanizer cadres and is one of the factors of the dissatisfaction of mechanizers with their profession. The quality of spare parts is being improved sluggishly. They are produced at several hundred large and small plants and shops of 38 different ministries and departments. The shortage of spare parts is worsened by their dispersal among the numerous warehouses of kolkhozes, sovkhoses and Sel'khoztekhnika enterprises. The lack of spare part guarantees based on technical substantiated norms also urges customers to buy parts not currently needed. This leads to stockpiling spare parts in warehouses, thus freezing enterprise working capital.

A possibility of ensuring the availability of spare parts, such as rebuilding them, is not used to the fullest extent. The USSR Goskomsel'khoztekhnika repair enterprises rebuild parts worth some 500 million rubles. This, however, is no more than one-fifth of the overall amount of new spare part procurements. A considerable percentage of parts suitable for rebuilding are turned into scrap because of insufficient reciprocal interest on the part of kolkhozes, sovkhoses and repair enterprises, by virtue of the fact that repair fund allocations are based on metal scrap prices.

We must economically interest not only farms but also respective departments in recycling residual resources of worn parts on the basis of mutually profitable evaluations of repair stocks.

A substantial reorientation of the economic mechanism is needed to regulate equipment writeoffs. Machinery writeoffs are a structural component of the process of equipment updating and replacing obsolete equipment with new and the latest equipment. It should be technically and economically substantiated. However, the writeoff system currently in effect lacks the necessary economic substantiation and does not contribute to the utilization of the residual life of contemporary complex machinery. This system was formulated and adopted for tractors such as Universal and SKhTZ, the simplicity of whose design made it possible to determine the degree of wear of their main assemblies and machine units visually, based on the conclusions of an experienced mechanic. The residual value of such machines was little

different from the value of the metal shipped out as scrap after the tractor had been written off.

The technical complexity of contemporary machines, which consist of a large number of units and assemblies of varying reliability and durability, the widespread anonymous repair system and restoring the work capability of machines by replacing broken-down assemblies and machine units with new or repaired parts require the adoption of an essentially different approach to writeoffs, for it is not possible to determine the expediency of writing off a specific machine unit according to the length of its stay in a given farm.

At the time it is written off, a tractor has some 20 percent old, worn-out parts and about 80 percent assemblies and machine units which could be rebuilt and reused. Consequently, the residual value of such a piece of machinery is relatively quite high.

Studies have indicated that under the existing system machinery which contains expensive parts, assemblies and units of significant usability, are written off. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes make no more than partial use of such parts. Most of them are turned into scrap. This causes substantial losses not only to individual enterprises but to the national economy as a whole.

In terms of residual life, the distinction between written-off tractors and those set for first and second capital repairs is insignificant. Considering that the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture alone write off some 200,000 tractors annually, and that the figure is considerably higher for the national economy as a whole, we can see that the current procedure for machinery writeoffs does not have adequate economic grounds and results in substantial losses to the economy.

Bearing in mind the structure of the usability of written-off machines, it would be expedient to take them to the farm repair workshops or sell them to the repair enterprises of Goskomsel'khoztekhnika, which would dismantle them and discard unusable parts only. This would mean that not entire machines but merely the worn-out parts would be essentially discarded. This procedure is economically more sound and ensures the full utilization of machine parts and assemblies, consistent with their technical structure. The Goskomsel'khoztekhnika enterprises should freely issue the farms new or rebuilt parts, machine units and assemblies, thus organizing an exchange fund, payable out of funds the farms have earned from the sale of written-off machinery.

Such a writeoff procedure would generate an interest in maintaining the equipment. It would free kolkhozes and sovkhozes from the complex work of determining the technical condition of written-off machinery. It will allow the fuller utilization of the remaining life of parts through skilled defectoscopy. It will concentrate the repair stocks in the hands of the specialized enterprises of Goskomsel'khoztekhnika and create conditions for increasing the production of rebuilt parts.

Savings from writing off equipment only on the basis of reusing workable assemblies and parts would total between 150 and 180 million rubles for the

country at large, including some 40 million rubles from DT-75 tractors. Further economic benefits would be obtained from the recycling of rebuilt parts, worth 190-220 million rubles. The national economic effectiveness would be expressed in reduced metal outlays for the manufacturing of new parts and spare parts, upgrading the technical readiness of the machine-tractor fleet by reducing idling for technical reasons, and increasing the load of Goskomsel'khoztekhnika repair enterprises by concentrating repairs of assemblies and parts of written-off equipment rebuilt at specialized repair enterprises. This would also lead to a relative lowering of the need for capital investments for the development of repair-servicing facilities.

Many of the problems of the expanded reproduction of the material and technical base of agriculture have been adequately developed in theory and could be resolved more successfully and efficiently if not only kolkhozes and sovkhozes but all enterprises of ministries and departments within the agroindustrial complex become interested in the end results and in their application. It is clear now that agriculture is not only a producer of goods for the population and raw materials for the processing industry but also the largest consumer of industrial output which is gathering economic strength in influencing its partners in the agroindustrial complex on the basis of the mutual advantages of cooperation within the controlled economic management mechanism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

DEVELOPED SPECIALISM AND THE FORMATION OF CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC THINKING

AU250601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84)
pp 61-71

[Article by A. Abalkin, doctor of economic sciences. Article published as part of a discussion]

[Text] Quite a few difficult tasks will have to be solved in the process of perfecting the socialist society that has been built in the USSR. The development of contemporary economic thinking holds one of the central positions among these tasks. The topicality of this task is conditioned by the fact that its solution represents an important and indispensable condition for shifting the economy to the path of intensive development and of qualitative improvement of the economic mechanism. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized at a jubilee plenum of the Board of the USSR Union of Writers, "We most closely link the improvement of the national economy's efficiency and the intensification of production with the acceleration of assimilation of scientific discoveries and of achievements of engineering thinking. And, of course, with the restructuring of the economic thinking itself."

The development of contemporary economic thinking is not an isolated process. It is a component part of a complex and multifaceted process of a certain reorientation of social awareness. It is necessitated by the deep qualitative changes in the life of the socialist society and by the appearance of new and insufficiently studied phenomena both in the country's internal life and on the international scene. What is required is a critical interpretation of theoretical formulas created earlier and an overcoming of some existing stereotypes of thinking.

Recent years have been marked by intensive theoretical activity in the party that was initiated by the 26th Congress and the Congress resolution on preparing a new edition of the CPSU Program. The November 1982 and June 1983 plenums of the Party's Central Committee and the creative discussion marking the year of Marx performed an important role in the interpretation of accumulated experience and of current tasks. The contemporary stage of this multifaceted activity is directly related to the party's work in preparing the new edition of the CPSU Program and to those appraisals, tenets and conclusions that found expression in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speeches.

At the present time the party's theoretical activity is clearly characterized by a profoundly scientific approach, realistic and well-considered appraisals and the combination of continuity in analyzing socioeconomic and political processes with a creative and innovative approach to solving the problems posed by life. It is necessary also to note such specific characteristics as constructiveness whenever new theoretical formulas are translated into the language of political decisions, are used as a basis for working out and adopting important state acts or long-term programs and plans, and are implemented in the practical activities of the working masses. "It is clear," Comrade K. U. Chernenko has said, "that this requires energetic economic and organizational efforts. At the same time, what is also needed in this connection is persistent work to raise the awareness of the masses and to achieve, if you will, a certain reorientation of social awareness to enable it to more quickly adopt the new ideas advanced by the party and more resolutely rid itself of antiquated and backward views."

It is only in this way that the full revolutionary and transforming role of ideas can be revealed. For, as the founders of Marxism-Leninism emphasized, they become a material force when they take hold of the masses.

This thesis is always true and is especially important in our period.

Socialism, by its nature, is a society systematically organized and consciously administered. In such a society it is only a comprehensive knowledge of objective necessity, a clear political course based on the conclusions of science and free of all subjectivism, and a conscious participation of the masses in historical creativity that can ensure the rational and effective organization of social life, the progressive development of society, and its ascent on the steps of socioeconomic progress.

And the higher the level that the socialist society reaches in this movement and the more mature society becomes, the greater the role of the conscious principle and the stricter the claims on the scientific standard and on the depths of social awareness and in particular on the economic thinking the restructuring of which represents an indispensable link in all work in perfecting the socialism built in the USSR.

Appraisal of the historical stage at which the country now finds itself has an essential place in the party's entire theoretical activity. In this connection it is especially to provide a thoroughly considered and realistic analysis of the specific characteristics of the period through which we have passed, allowing no belittling of great and indisputable achievements, no embellishment of reality, and no dramatization of shortcomings. This is what V. I. Lenin taught us, this is our party's approach to this question today.

In creatively interpreting the accumulated experience, objectively appraising the situation, and adopting a critical approach toward earlier formulas, the CPSU has concluded that our country has entered the stage of developed socialism and is now at the beginning of that stage. And developed socialism itself represents a natural and long historical process that is characterized by its own stages of maturity.

The present stage can be appraised as the initial stage. Its peculiarity is in the fact that, on the one hand, in the development of production forces, in social relations, and in the political superstructure, it clearly shows the features that essentially distinguish contemporary Soviet society from socialism in its basic form. The depth of these changes shows that the country has entered a new stage, the stage of developed socialism. On the other hand, certain phenomena are apparent at this initial stage which can on no account be considered as characteristic of developed socialism. They include in particular the existence of serious disproportions, the lag in the development of agriculture and the sphere of services, and a high specific proportion of unskilled and physically heavy manual labor.

These specific features of the initial stage of developed socialism also determine the directions of its further perfecting. Under contemporary conditions the party's policy and long-term strategy are aimed at bringing all aspects of life of Soviet society, as Comrade K. U. Chernenko has said, into accord with the highest, the most exacting, and, of course, scientifically substantiated notions of socialism. The successful implementation of the long-term strategy worked out by the party will move Soviet society to a new and higher stage of maturity. That will be a society fully meeting the highest criteria of developed socialism and directly growing into communism.

Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate between the criteria according to which the country's entry into the stage of developed socialism is defined with scientific precision, and the criteria that characterize a complete, comprehensive consolidated mature socialist society.

Therefore, it is wrong, both in theory and in realistic policy, to equate the contemporary state of Soviet society, with all of its specific historical peculiarities, with the criteria of developed socialism. Such an equation would be tantamount to wittingly or unwittingly weakening and belittling the attractive force of the socialist ideal, to approaching the appraisal of socialism with simplified measures, and to fitting the objective criteria of the maturity of socialism to its actual state. The conception of developed socialism itself as a relatively autonomous and long historical stage, as worked out by the party, is of extraordinary importance. This approach makes it possible to overcome the simplification of the notion of socialism as a short-term condition of society, as some kind of a transfer station the attainment of which is followed by an immediate advance to the higher stage of communism. The real dialectic of life has turned out to be considerably more complicated. Even after it has entered the stage of mature socialism, socialist society continues for a long time to function and develop with the limits of the first stage of communist formation. It is only after the entire complex of the tasks connected with this stage by their origin and character has been solved and after all the necessary prerequisites have been accumulated that the direct construction of communism can begin. All this must be clearly absorbed by social awareness in order to overcome the discrepancy--revealed by life--between certain theoretical formulas developed in the recent past and the real course of social development and to finally and definitely overcome the easy notions about the paths and time terms of transition to the higher state of communism, the easy notions that were current in a certain period.

It seems that a reorientation of social awareness cannot be put off. The problem is ripe, the party's theoretical methods have become sufficiently defined, and no procrastination can be justified in this connection. This urgency is attested to by the fact that, until recently, the appropriate restructuring of the social sciences, of their study in higher and secondary level schools, and of the propaganda system had been extremely slow.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum sharply criticized the work of a number of scientific research institutes, their failure to engage in a thorough and specific research of social phenomena and current economic problems, and their shortcomings such as limiting themselves to their own "dissertation" and group interests and concerning themselves with petty topics. The recent CPSU Central Committee resolution on the work of the Economics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences notes that, in the scientific research conducted by the institute, the fundamental problems of perfecting the economic system of developed socialist society have not been analyzed sufficiently thoroughly, that the study of the methodological questions of the political economy of socialism is still lagging, and that the alienation of this study from practice has not been finally and definitely overcome.

Quite a few obsolete theses have been preserved in the study programs of higher education institutions and in the practice of lectures on philosophy, political economy and scientific communism, and the new ideas worked out by the party are definitely not taken into account sufficiently. As a result, the ideological-theoretical standard of lectures is being lowered and a serious discrepancy is being created between contemporary demands and the actual content of the study courses. What all this demonstrates is the force of inertia and adherence to old habits in the work of higher schools, which were discussed at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The development of contemporary economic thinking is a complex task. Any campaign-like approach or running to extremes is out of place in this connection. The party's contemporary theoretical thinking is developed on the solid and unshakable foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory. And it is only by relying on this foundation and absorbing the entire depth of the revolutionary theory and methodology of the workers class that it is possible to successfully and effectively form a contemporary understanding of the processes of social development.

In the course of perfecting developed socialism--and this is the party's main strategic task--it will be necessary not only simply to eliminate certain negative phenomena and bring up the lagging sectors. This is important and necessary but by no means enough. What is needed is raising all spheres of our life to a new and qualitatively higher level, and, naturally, first and foremost, the sphere of the economy because the latter is and will continue to be the basis of our entire social, political and spiritual progress.

Prior to considering the essence of these questions, it is necessary to note the following: A correct understanding of the meaning and main directions of advancement of the Soviet economy to a qualitatively new stage represents the

starting point of the formation of contemporary economic thinking. Therefore, a positive analysis of these questions is not a digression from the topic but is in fact directly related to it.

If we formulate the problem in general terms, then increasing the maturity of the socialist economy primarily implies advancing to higher levels of socialization of production and this involves not just a formal but a real socialization or, as Lenin put it, socialization of production "in practice." This is a socialization in the broadest sense, that is, in its material-technical, organizational-economic and social aspects.

The point of departure here is a qualitative transformation of production forces. And the essence of the problem is not merely a matter of raising the level of these forces but a matter precisely of a qualitative transformation, of a fundamental reequipping of the country's production apparatus. As regards the level of production forces, considered from its qualitative aspect, it is sufficiently high in our country. The dynamic development of several scores of years and a comparison with the highest world indexes clearly show this. For instance, today the USSR's basic production funds exceed the 1940 level 19.5 times and their 1960 volume more than 6 times. In comparison with the prewar period, the power supply to labor has increased nearly 8 times in industry and over 17 times in agriculture. Great successes have been achieved in the output of many of the most important types of products.

All this is the result of the advantages of the economic planning system, the party's purposeful policy, and the selfless labor of the Soviet people. This is our indisputable achievement. However, what is needed today is not simply a further improvement of indexes. It is necessary to advance to essentially different frontiers. What is involved in this connection is the introduction of new generations of machines. And of flexible automated systems and the adoption of technological changes and changes in the production organization that are revolutionary in nature. In other words, the very latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution must be placed in the service of socialism. In the next three or four five-year plan periods it will be necessary on this basis to reequip all spheres of application of social labor.

A labor force that meets contemporary demands is indispensable, the worker of the new type is needed, the worker who is and will continue to be society's main production force. The reform of the general education and professional school which is now in progress represents a major landmark on the road of solving this task (though not only this task).

The qualitative transformations in the sphere of production forces should ensure in the final analysis a cardinal improvement of the efficiency of social production and of labor productivity. And this is of decisive importance both as regards raising the maturity of our society to higher levels and as regards ensuring its victory in the historical antagonism with the capitalist system. The advance to the highest world levels of labor productivity is a task that must be solved within the historical framework of developed socialist society.

The fundamental technical reequipment of the production apparatus and the shifting of the economy to the tracks of intensive operations depends to a decisive extent on the quality, structure and effectiveness of the means of labor. Marx saw the essence of the intensive type of expanded reproduction precisely in the introduction of more efficient means of production. Hence the need for an accelerated development of the machine-building industry that is and will continue to be the leading and generating force of scientific-technical progress and of overcoming the lag in several directions of this progress. To solve this task, it is necessary, in our opinion, to carry out a serious structural maneuver connected with changes in the priorities in the distribution of resources to the advantage of the machine-building industry. At the same time it will be necessary to considerably accelerate the renovation of the production apparatus and the replacement of physically and morally obsolete basic funds. It is only on this basis that it is possible to achieve a consistent and gradual advance of the national economy to a new technical level and that a material-technical basis can be built which fully meets the requirements of developed socialism.

Simultaneously with the qualitative transformation of production forces, the party also sets the task of a corresponding perfecting of production relations. This implies the need for fairly deep and serious changes in society's economic basis. Unfortunately, the political economy is not yet ready to provide the necessary scientifically substantiated solutions and recommendations.

In our opinion, the qualitative changes in the organization of social production, an essential improvement of the level of its specialization, and the organization of a reliable and smoothly functioning system of economic communications must be given priority. In other words, priority must be given to changes in the organizational-economic subsystem of production relations. This will entail very important and essential consequences. What is primarily considered here is a transition to economic growth on a balanced basis which will make it possible to attach decisive importance in production planning to the consumer and to intensify the social orientation of the development of the national economy.

Throughout the whole of our history so far, our country's national economy has developed on a different basis. The lack of the necessary balance and the existence of shortages that were justified at one time have begun to be accepted by some planners and economic officials as something proper or, at least, inevitable. These notions, reflecting the practice of a period, have turned into dogma and today they are seriously slowing down the progressive transformations in the economy.

A comprehensively balanced development, the existence of a system of planned reserves, and the reliability of economic communications are the distinguishing features of the economy of developed socialism. A consistent intensification of the economy and a flexible restructuring of production in accordance with rapidly changing demands and new scientific-technical achievements are only possible on this basis.

On the whole, the transition to the intensive mode of economic growth on a balanced basis will mark an essentially higher level of socialization of socialist production and a higher stage of planned organization. As a result, prerequisites will be created for significantly perfecting the social forms of the socialization of production, the prerequisites expressed by the development of the property relations and by the development of the entire mechanism of the property's socioeconomic realization.

The main direction in perfecting socialist production relations is to move the state and the kolkhoz forms of property of the means of production increasingly close to each other, interweave them, and, in the long term, fuse them. Proceeding from the accumulated experience, the current level of maturity of our society, and the progressive trends of its development, the party has concluded that the main and basic existing class differences would be wiped out at the stage of developed socialism. This will be made possible only under the conditions of a single unified all-people's ownership of the means of production.

It is completely natural that this will not simply be produced by a juridical act. The view of ownership as a purely juridical and legal relationship can be considered as having been overcome by our social science. The creation of a single unified all-people's socialist ownership represents a qualitative change in the system of production relations and a result of a higher stage of the real socialization of production. At the same time, this is an important frontier on the path of strengthening the Soviet society's social homogeneity.

However, despite all their importance, these changes do not exhaust the transformations in the relations of ownership. What is now becoming increasingly topical is the perfecting of those specific economic, organizational and legal forms within the framework of which and by means of which the functioning of social ownership and its economic realization are ensured. Historical experience has shown that the consolidation of the all-people's nature of acquisition of property does not mean the automatic transformation of every working man into a real and sovereign, a wise and enthusiastic manager of social production. This is a complex process that requires time and the creation of corresponding conditions.

The economic and organizational forms that make it possible to directly bring together the worker's personal interests and the interests of the labor collective and of the entire society occupy a place of special significance among these conditions. The economic accountability brigades, working according to a unified order, are a striking example of these forms engendered by the masses' creativity itself. As is known, the economical attitude toward tasks, mutual assistance and exacting mutual control are brought together in these brigades. It is important to find equally effective forms of realization of social property also at the higher levels of economic management, that is, at the level of enterprises, branches and regions.

The search for the application of these forms are indissolubly linked with qualitative improvements in organization and discipline. What is involved in this case is not simply a matter of introducing elementary order (that is, of course, indispensable) and not only a matter of eliminating gross violations

of work regulations (they must be resolutely ended). The question is a matter of principle, that is, of forming the type of labor discipline that is characteristic for socialism.

As is known, every mode of production has created its own labor discipline that was suited to it. Under feudalism it was the discipline of the stick, of noneconomic coercion. It was sufficiently effective for that period. Capitalism has created a higher and more refined type of discipline, that is, the discipline based on hunger and the threat of losing work and sinking to the bottom. And it cannot be denied that capitalism boiled--as it is said--the masses in the factory boiler and, as a result, achieved a sufficiently firm discipline. It goes without saying that this discipline serves to enrich the magnates of financial capital and is antipopular in its nature. But nevertheless, it does create the necessary order in the work process itself and ensures an efficient performance of the function of the aggregate worker.

Socialism should create a higher and more efficient type of labor discipline. And that can only be a discipline that is based on a proprietary attitude to tasks. A complete and general assertion of this type of discipline is one of the important criteria of the achievement of its developed and mature forms by socialism. The fulfillment of this task appears at the same time as one of the directions in the perfecting of the socialist production relations and of the socioeconomic forms of realization of social property.

The advance to the higher frontiers in the development of socialism also requires a thorough restructuring of the entire economic mechanism. This is not simply a matter of liquidation of bottlenecks or of substituting some indexes with others or of mobility in the individual management links. What is on the agenda in this connection are the qualitative changes that make it possible to advance the entire economic mechanism to the level of requirements of developed socialism.

It is sufficiently clear at present that this restructuring cannot be achieved by means of an act issued once and for all. Time, a series of consecutive stages and the experimental verification of different variations and proposals are needed for this purpose. Hasty and poorly coordinated measures as well as slowness and delays in ripe transformation are impermissible in this connection. At the same time, in solving the present tasks, it is necessary to clearly see the prospects for future development and to have an exact picture of the model that should form as the final product of the efforts made.

A program of perfecting the economic mechanism based on scientific studies and the generalization of our country's experience and of the experience of the fraternal countries of socialism will contribute to a coordinated solution of the entire complex of problems that arise. In our opinion, this program should acquire the force of political decision and become an integral link in the party's long-term economic strategy. The theoretical concept of the economic mechanism of developed socialism, the characteristics of the consecutive stages of its formation, and the main directions of the complex and mutually coordinated perfecting of its most important elements could be incorporated in such a program. At the same time, it would be necessary to

determine the necessary reproduction, organizational and cadre conditions for its consistent implementation. It is on the basis of transformations in production forces and in the system of production relations that the standard and quality of life of the Soviet people will be improved essentially and that noticeable progress will be made in social development and in the spiritual sphere.

Thus, it is becoming increasingly clear and obvious that the Soviet society has reached frontiers that, in a certain sense, represent a turning point. Deep, qualitative, and revolutionary changes in the material-technical base and in the entire sphere of social relations are ripe. The idea of the merging of two revolutions--the scientific-technical and the social--also reflects the necessity of carrying out these transformations. This idea also indicates that only socialism, carrying with it a social renovation of the world, is incapable of mastering the contemporary scientific-technical revolution.

The profound structural transformations and the new conditions of socioeconomic development and the scope and complexity of forthcoming tasks urgently demand the elaboration of contemporary economic thinking. It is not needed only by the narrow circle of scientists-economists and by the individuals who are professionally engaged in the management of the national economy. The more actively the process of democratization of management advances, the more topical becomes the task of forming the contemporary economic thinking as an element of social awareness.

Contemporary economic thinking can be recognized as such only if it is strictly scientific and if it takes into account the contemporary real and changed conditions of economic operations.

A natural question arises in this connection: Is present economic thinking not scientific? Answering this question, it is necessary to take into account the fact that what is involved are the dominant stereotypes of economic thinking and the notions that are widespread among practical workers.

Let us start with the fact that an underestimation of objective laws and an aspiration to bypass and "outwit" them have been preserved to this day (and not as much in books as in the mass economic thinking). How much has been written about the law of systematic and proportional development of the national economy. And yet, there is a mass practice of working out and confirming unbalanced plans which is pursued in the hope that perhaps everything will work out somehow and that the lacking resources will be found "in the course of the plan's fulfillment." The blatant disregard for the requirement and natural law that the growth of labor productivity must outstrip the growth of work remuneration can also be cited as an example in this connection. The results of this practice are very negative. This practice reveals a lack of ability to relate the general theoretical truths to the concrete analysis of a concrete economic situation.

There is a certain underestimation of the primacy of the socioeconomic conditions and factors in the development of the national economy. A clearly exaggerated notion of the role of natural conditions, of everything that

Marxism calls geographical environment--a notion that is far from being scientific--has widely asserted itself in mass economic thinking. It appears as one of the objective material conditions of society's life. But Marxism has never considered this factor as a determining one.

Despite all this, we very often try to explain away all difficulties of agriculture with difficult weather conditions and the strain in the national economy with the deteriorating conditions of extraction of economic minerals. These questions are not new and they have been sufficiently thoroughly elaborated in economic theory. Can additional capital investments lead to a reduction of efficiency? This question was discussed as early as the beginning of the century. And, answering it, Lenin wrote that, yes, they can--but, he added, only if we take the technical equipment as immutable.

But economic thinking--if it is really scientific--cannot consider the technical equipment as immutable and abstract it from scientific-technological progress. "...The economist," Lenin wrote, "must always look ahead, to the progress of technology; otherwise he will immediately find himself lagging behind, because whoever refuses to look forward regresses in history: There is no and can be no middle way" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 5, pp 137-138). Economic thinking must be oriented always--and today all the more--to technological or scientific-technological progress. Considering the matter differently is tantamount to attaching a determining and self-sufficient importance to natural factors.

But this is not all. Production relations are always a decisive factor in scientific-technological progress. Precisely they provide the main and most powerful incentive for a steady and rapid development of production forces and for improving the efficiency of social production. But they can also become the main braking agent on the path of economic growth. This happens whenever the objectively necessary correspondence between the achieved level of production forces and the tendencies of their development, on the one hand, and the concrete forms of production relations on the other, is violated.

The violation of this correspondence clearly revealed itself at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. The manifold increased production forces seemed to be out of control and were difficult to manage in view of the methods of economic operations and management that had been preserved from the past. The existing structure of management and organization of planning turned out to be incapable of ensuring high rates of scientific-technological progress and the transition of the economy to the path of intensive operations. The rates of economic growth were essentially slowed down and serious disproportions developed as a result.

This is the main and the deepest cause of the difficulties which our economy encountered in those years. Seeking the causes elsewhere is tantamount to deviating from the principles of scientific analysis and to depriving oneself of the potential of working out effective methods for overcoming the negative phenomena.

Finally, it is also necessary to take into account the circumstances that the need for a scientific approach in economic thinking (as well as in social

awareness as a whole) increases considerably simultaneously with the development of the socialist society and the growth of its maturity. In the final analysis, this is connected with a greater complication of the tasks of social progress. Lenin unfailingly demanded to go further, to strive to achieve more, and to "unfailingly move from the easier to the more difficult tasks" without which "no progress in general is possible and no progress in socialist construction is possible" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 196). The increased demand for the scientific approach in all aspects of social awareness results from the increased complication of the tasks at hand.

The need for contemporary realities to be reflected in economic thinking is primarily conditioned by the profoundly changed conditions in the functioning of the economy and by the transition to the intensive type of reproduction. It is usually written in scientific works that there is no purely extensive or purely intensive type of reproduction and that it is necessary only to consider the prevalence of some factors or other.

However, this approach creates the impression that only quantitative differences are involved here: the greater or lesser effect of various factors on the dynamic nature of the economy. The fact that a transition to an essentially new type of economic growth is now in progress is thereby suppressed. And the matter can on no account be reduced to changes in the correlation between the individual factors. What is involved are a thorough restructuring of the entire structure of social reproduction, a qualitatively new role for science in this process and a fundamentally changed system of social needs.

Political economy faces the necessity of working out a new, contemporary, and, naturally, Marxist concept of economic growth, including a new approach to the problem of the rates of growth. What is required first and foremost is a resolute and consistent renunciation of the gross production, purely quantitative, or purely volume-considering approaches in the appraisal of economic dynamics. The center of attention must be transferred to revealing and measuring the final national economic results and the level (fullness) of satisfaction of social needs.

The fact that this makes an essentially new approach necessary can be judged by this relatively particular example. It is clear that demands are not met with millions of rubles but by means of the use value. The orientation toward the consumer moves to the place of primary importance the fulfillment of obligations in product deliveries according to the volume, variety and quality stipulated by the contract concerned. Here the very approach to planning changes: to use the accepted way of saying it, the portfolio of orders becomes the basis of the production programs of enterprises and associations.

The approach to appraising results also changes. The orders for product deliveries according to the concluded contracts cannot be overfulfilled. They can be fulfilled by 100 or fewer percent but they cannot be overfulfilled even by 1 percent because any products delivered in excess of the contract or in violation of contractual demands are not accepted for inclusion in the count. Our industry is consistently shifting to this system. However, the gross production and volume-considering approach has not been finally and definitely

overcome to this day. This shows how tenacious the force of inertia is and how difficult it is to introduce contemporary needs and the positions worked out by the party into economic thinking.

The struggle against the gross production and volume-considering approach not only requires changed methods to measure economic dynamics but also has another structural aspect. Thus, the appraisal of the development of industry by the general rates of its growth--regardless of whether they are measured by the gross, commodity, or net output, continues to be made purely from the viewpoint of gross and average production and continues to divide not only all values but also the shortcomings of any average quantities. For instance, the annual growth of industrial production by, say, 5 to 6 percent can hide some very different processes both from the viewpoint of scientific-technological progress and from the viewpoint of extent of satisfaction of demand.

Let us consider the problem with reference to more concrete examples. The economic analyses frequently operate with comparisons between the rates of growth of aaa and bbb groups. But these, too, are comparisons based on gross production, on the volume of production. The present structure of group aaa is such that the production of the materials of labor (raw materials, fuel, building materials) takes up four-fifths of the group's operations and the production of the means of labor (machines, equipment, tools) takes up only one-fifth of its operations. A stabilization of the extraction of raw materials--and it is completely realistic to allow for this--and the increase in the output of the means of labor, let us say by 10 percent, will result in a mere 2 percent expansion of group aaa. Is it really possible to judge real processes only on the basis of such a figure? Of course not. An analytical and differentiating approach must be prevalent in contemporary economic thinking.

Further, the contemporary scale of production has achieved complete satisfaction (considered from the quantitative aspect) of many traditional needs. Let us consider a concrete example, the manufacture of footwear. Soviet industry now produces a larger quantity of leather footwear than the United States, the FRG, Great Britain and Japan taken together. Its output (in millions of pairs) has been virtually stabilized at the same level in recent years. The variety will continue to increase constantly.

This means that some sort of different and untraditional approach to the evaluation of rates of growth is required here. Output of products which meet demand is one thing, and output of commodities that meet changed demand is quite another thing.

At the same time, there is a completely new question of measuring the qualitative aspects of the dynamics of the economy. For every one of us well understands that the production volume of footwear in millions of pairs by even count says nothing about the quality and about the conformity of production to the existing social demand. This problem becomes even more sharply outlined in measuring the quality of the means of production, that is, machines, equipment, tools, as well as metals and other building materials. Consequently, the existing indexes of economic growth cannot reflect the real

dynamics of production of use values. And whereas it has been possible to accept this earlier, a new and more substantive method is needed today.

And one more thing. There are quite considerable differences between the dynamics of the production of goods for current consumption (means of labor, most consumer goods) and the production of durable goods, that is, housing, means of transport, machine tools and so forth. We are carrying out a gigantic program of housing construction. Approximately 520 to 540 million square meters of housing are being regularly completed for the fourth consecutive five-year plan period. Formally it appears as though there is no growth in this respect. But what is needed to take into account the accumulated real property and the quality of the completed projects.

It is possible to consider also another picture: the stabilization of the pool of metal-processing equipment (by number of units) and the corresponding stabilization of the delivery of new machine tools to replace the tools that have been taken out of commission due to physical wear and tear and obsolescence. For, already today, the growth of the pool of machine tools is accompanied by the aging and deteriorated utilization of these tools and the quantity of the delivery of new metal-cutting machine tools is even decreasing. It is absolutely obvious that it is necessary to change over to the evaluation of the quality of economic dynamics.

Thus, deep qualitative changes are taking place in the system of social reproduction. They are leading toward an essentially new economic situation that is basically different from the situation that has been characteristic for the preceding stages of socialist construction. And in this connection this article has considered one part of these changes. Many of the problems that have been sufficiently elucidated in pertinent literature have been discussed here only in general terms.

All this together intensifies the necessity of forming contemporary economic thinking. And the essence of the problem is not only to ensure that the already ascertained scientific truths will be absorbed in the mass awareness. Many of the contemporary methods are yet to be worked out and new phenomena and processes in the country's socioeconomic life must still be thoroughly researched.

Economic science and its core, the political economy of socialism, have a special responsibility in solving these tasks. They must advance in their development to the level of the high demands dictated by the position and responsibility of science under the conditions of developed socialist society.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/6

FROM LIBERATION TO SOCIALIST RENAISSANCE: REVOLUTIONS OF THE FORTIES IN
EASTERN EUROPE

AU100601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84)
pp 72-83

[Article by Prof I. Orlik, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The 1940s of the 20th century will go down in the history of mankind as a decade of powerful social shocks, great political changes and social revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries. The first half of the 1940s was the time of the bitter struggle of the Soviet people and of the patriotic national liberation forces of the occupied countries, forces headed by the communists, as well as of the peoples and armies of the bourgeois states of the anti-Hitlerite coalition against the shock force of world imperialist reaction, German fascism and Japanese militarism. The mid-1940s were the unforgettable time of the great victory over fascism, to which the Soviet Union made the decisive contribution. The second half of the decade brought the years of revolutionary transformations in a whole range of the world's countries, with them embarking on the path of building socialism and of the formation of the world socialist system.

Four decades separate us from the time when the people's democratic revolutions developed one after another in the central and southeast European countries. This was by no means unexpected or accidental. The acute socioeconomic, political and national problems that had ripened over a long period inevitably resulted in the development of a revolutionary situation in that region. Characterizing some of these problems, V. I. Lenin wrote as early as the eve of World War I that the "time" would come "for the whole of Eastern Europe...when the peoples themselves will say their free and decisive word" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch" [Complete Collected Works], vol 22, p 142).

It was especially under the impact of the Great October Revolution that, in the first half of this century, the peoples of central and southeast Europe several times rose up in struggle against oppression and exploitation. However, it was only under the conditions that developed in the middle of the 1940s that they were able to act resolutely against the bourgeois and landowner oppression and confidently embark on the path of democratic renewal and building socialism. The geographical definition of "central and southeast Europe" (in 1913, Lenin includes the Austria of that time and the Balkans in

Eastern Europe--see, for instance, op. cit., vol 23, p 314) which, in our days, has become synonymous with the European socialist region.

The revolutions in Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the eastern part of Germany, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia opened up a new stage in the world revolutionary process and were the most important events in the history of the 20th century after the Great October Socialist Revolution.

What is the essence of the revolutions of the 1940s in Eastern Europe and what are their consequences and international significance? The answer to this question is by no means just a matter of academic interest from the viewpoint of historical knowledge. Their experience represents a valuable asset of the contemporary world communist and workers movement and is undoubtedly instructive for further revolutions as well. It is no accident that the opponents of the revolutionary transformation of the world try in every way possible to discredit and besmirch the essence and significance of the revolutions of the 1940s. In this respect, the answer to the aforementioned question is important for ideologically debunking and unmasking the falsifications of the reactionary bourgeois ideologues.

As is known, the course of the revolutionary process in any individual country or group of countries is conditioned by internal and external factors and by their close interweaving and interaction. Both the internal and external factors can either promote or oppose this process. As a result, an intricate complex of revolutionary conditions forms and the objective and full appraisal of these conditions requires an equally intricate and complex approach and examination of all component parts. Analyzing the origins of the revolutionary process, Lenin observed: "Revolutions are not made to order and are not timed to this or that moment, but mature in the process of historical development and burst out at the moment conditioned by the complex of an entire range of internal and external causes" (op. cit., vol 36, p 531).

The revolutions in the East European countries were a completely natural and objective occurrence. They had been prepared through a long and painful process of internal development of those countries and ensured by the favorable external conditions that developed as a result of the defeat of German fascism by the Soviet people and their armed forces.

The revolutions of the 1940s took place under the conditions of a deepening general crisis of capitalism in the wake of World War II, a crisis at a new stage of capitalism. Their possibilities were determined by the general correlation of forces in the postwar world and, first and foremost, by the strengthening of the international position of the Soviet Union, which had shouldered the main burden of the war against fascism and fulfilled with honor its liberation mission in relations with the East European peoples.

The revolutions were able to occur under the conditions created by the victorious advance of the Red Army in the final stages of World War II. However, this advance was not the cause for them. Never and under no circumstances can revolutions be engendered by a single, even the most favorable external factor. Only the internal development, the intensification of antagonistic contradictions, can lead to revolutions. In Eastern Europe,

it was precisely the broad popular masses, resisting the fascist occupiers and local collaborators, that determined the course and direction of the revolution.

The bourgeois historians continue even today to persistently repeat the old fabrication--first spread 40 years ago--about the "export of the revolution," claiming that the revolution was allegedly "brought" to that region "by the Red Army." Grossly distorting the real course of events and juggling the facts, our ideological opponents try to present the entire postwar development in Eastern Europe as the imposition of some kind of "Soviet model" of socialism.

What can be said as regards this kind of claim? Yes, it is an indisputable fact that the Red Army crushed the fascist military machine. It thereby assumed a considerable part of the destructive function of the revolution in virtually all East European countries. Only a notorious falsifier is able to deny even the fact that it was thanks to the liberating mission of the Soviet armed forces that the peoples of East European countries were able to achieve a renaissance of their statehood and national dignity and that the conditions were created for fundamental transformations in all spheres of social life. No less obvious is also the fact that it was as a result of the liberation that a free expression of the will of the peoples of those countries was made possible, a free expression of the will that, in turn, opened up the road to the establishment of the people's democratic system and the subsequent transition to the construction of socialism.

Of course, no one can deny, for instance, that it was precisely the Red Army that played the main role in the liberation of Romania and in rescuing its people from the fascist yoke. There is also no doubt about the fact that the entry of the Soviet forces on Bulgarian territory was of decisive importance for the success of the armed uprising in Sofia and the transfer of power in the entire country to the Fatherland Front and, then, for the protection of the people's power against Hitlerite hordes and internal reaction. It is a further indisputable historical fact that the Soviet Union's unfailing assistance to and support for the national liberation movement in Yugoslavia played an enormous role in thwarting the plans, nurtured by the West, to prevent a victory of the socialist revolution in that country, just as it is also an indisputable fact that the Red Army's successful completion of the Belgrade operation was of the greatest military-political importance for the victorious outcome of the struggle waged over long years by the antifascist forces headed by the communists. Neither can anyone doubt the decisive role of the Soviet armed forces in liberating--in heavy and bloody battles--the peoples of Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

All this is so. However, it is an equally incontrovertible fact that the presence of Soviet troops on the territory of a country they had liberated on no account implied that a people's democratic and, subsequently, socialist revolution would necessarily take place in that country. For instance, in Norway, where the Red Army wiped out the Hitlerites in the northern part of the country, no such revolution took place. The bourgeois system was preserved there. The same is also true of Austria. On the other hand, in Albania, the people took the power into their own hands although there were no

Soviet troops in the country. No less obvious is the indisputable fact that the main, most difficult, and basic function of the revolutions--the establishment of the new power and the implementation of cardinal socioeconomic transformations--was performed by the peoples themselves everywhere in the East European countries.

Therefore, the real profound origins of the revolutions must be primarily sought in the antifascist struggle and the people's resistance against the occupation regimes. The partisan movement and the antifascist national liberation war in the East European countries grew into the people's democratic revolutions that led to the overthrow of the power of the exploitative classes and the transfer of that power to the hands of the working people, the workers and peasants.

In November 1943, the National Liberation Committee of Yugoslavia was formed. It became the highest executive organ of people's authority in that country. In July 1944, the revolutionary democratic government was formed in the liberated territory of Poland. A month later, on 23 August, the people's uprising in Bucharest displaced the fascist dictatorship. Almost at the same time, a national liberation struggle developed in Slovakia, where local organs of people's authority were formed under the leadership of the communists. On 9 September, the national uprising triumphed in Bulgaria. In October 1944, the Provisional Democratic Government was formed in Albania. And in December of that same year, the Provisional National Government that declared war against fascist Germany was formed in the liberated territory of Hungary.

The revolutions took their first steps. These steps were followed by a long and tenacious struggle against the internal and external enemies of democracy and the socioeconomic transformations. However, it was already no longer possible to stop the objective revolutionary process. The popular masses were its motivating force.

The revolutions of the 1940s opened up wide possibilities for the social, economic and spiritual growth of the peoples of the East European countries. A qualitatively new stage began in their development along the path to a new socioeconomic formation. Never before in all the centuries of their history had these peoples experienced such profound and radical and, most importantly, progressive changes that were in accord with the interests of the overwhelming majority of society.

Immediately after liberation from fascism, the East European countries carried out their agrarian reforms. In the 1945-48 period, large and medium-sized industrial enterprises, transport and banks, including those owned by foreign capital, were nationalized. The system of capitalist monopolies was liquidated, dependence on foreign capital was eliminated and the foundation for a socialist economic order was laid.

Despite difficult economic situations and complicated internal political situations in the countries of the region and despite the subversive activities of international reaction, already in the early postwar years, the peoples of those countries succeeded in healing the wounds inflicted by the war and restoring their national economies. The Soviet Union assisted

enormous assistance to them in this connection. They obtained industrial equipment and raw materials from the USSR. The conclusion of numerous trade agreements was instrumental in expanding commodity trade between the Soviet Union and the East European countries threefold during the 1946-50 period. The USSR granted them considerable credit, provided a considerable number of technical plans and designs and delivered crude oil, coal, food supplies, cotton, iron ore and many other products and raw materials to them.

Despite our fatherland's colossal war losses and postwar difficulties, the Soviet Union extended material support to the East European countries. It provided substantial aid, primarily in food supplies, in the first postwar years when some of these countries faced the very real danger of mass hunger. Here are only some of the facts concerning that period. On 5 April 1946, K. Georgiev, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, wrote to the head of the Soviet government, J. V. Stalin, that "the aid provided earlier had considerably eased our urgent needs in food and feed supplies," but that "feeding the population in the coming 4 months, a period of intensified labor efforts, would be disrupted without additional aid in grain." The Bulgarian government asked for an additional delivery of 40,000 metric tons of grain. Within 10 days, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed it of the Soviet Union's decision to ship the required supply of grain to Bulgaria.

On several occasions, the Soviet Union provided aid in grain and other products to Romania. In 1945, it delivered 300,000 metric tons of grain to Romania, in the form of a loan. In June 1947, P. Groza, Romania's premier, said: "The years of drought have placed us in a difficult situation. We were forced to pay in gold to obtain corn from the West. The conditions imposed on us were difficult and, even in spite of that, we received very little corn. We were again compelled to knock on the doors of our friends in the East. We know that they had a drought and that, regardless of that, last year they loaned and shipped us 30,000 railcar loads of grain, requiring no guarantees in exchange and not asking for gold, and that we have not been able to repay that debt. Regardless of that, we have again turned to our friends and they have helped us and are helping us once again."

The Soviet Union also extended considerable financial assistance to the fraternal countries. Thus, in the 1945-49 period, Poland received from the USSR credits for the country's industrialization, which, according to the calculations of Polish economists, were equal to the value of the machines and equipment delivered by the United States to 11 West European countries under the "Marshall Plan," which was widely advertised by the imperialist propaganda.

The establishment of the new order took place under the conditions of a serious exacerbation of the international situation when, having unleashed the "cold war," the Western states tried to prevent the development of socialist revolutions and began to implement the policy of export of counterrevolution to Eastern Europe. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and several East European countries was of major importance in that situation. The Soviet Union thereby helped these countries emerge from the diplomatic isolation that the Western states were trying to maintain.

The increasingly stronger political cooperation was legally fixed by the friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance treaties. As early as during the war, the Soviet Union concluded such treaties with Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland, and then in 1948, with Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria. In the 1947-49 period, analogous treaties were concluded among the East European countries themselves.

On several occasions, the USSR provided great political and diplomatic support to the countries liberated from fascism. In the difficult international situation for Bulgaria in August 1945, when the governments of the United States and Britain advocated a postponement of the elections for the National Assembly and demanded that these elections be held under international control, threatening that otherwise they would not recognize the new Bulgarian authorities, the Soviet government provided major support for the people's order by establishing diplomatic relations with Bulgaria on 14 August 1945. A year later when, on the eve of the elections for the Grand National Assembly, the Western powers again tried to interfere in the country's internal affairs, they came up against the firm position of the Soviet representatives in the Allied Control Commission, who stood up in defense of the interests of the Bulgarian people.

The Soviet government sharply opposed the demands of the United States and Britain, which also tried to impose foreign control over the elections for Poland's Legislative Sejm. Analogous support was also extended to other countries in their struggle against imperialist interference.

The international situation toward the end of the 1940s, which deteriorated through the fault of the Western powers, and the need more quickly and effectively to solve the tasks of restoration of the war-devastated economy and ensuring the conditions for an accelerated socioeconomic development required a transition to more perfected forms of economic cooperation. The foundations for this cooperation were laid by the formation in January 1949 of CECA, the first international organization of socialist countries, which ensured mutual economic assistance, and later, the coordination of the planned economies and cooperation of the peoples of the fraternal countries.

A further aggravation of the international situation in the first half of the 1950, the "cold war" waged by the West against the socialist states, and the threat of imperialist aggression by the NATO bloc, which West Germany also joined toward the end of 1954--all this also required the strengthening of the military-political cooperation between the countries of socialism on a multilateral basis and the formation of the Warsaw Pact organization in May 1955. In forming their defense organization the Warsaw Pact member-states declared that the measure they had taken were measures taken in response to the aggressive actions of the Western powers and would be used to strengthen the defense of the socialist countries and safeguard international security in Europe.

The policy of exporting counterrevolution by means of which the Western powers expected to strengthen the positions of local and foreign reaction in Eastern Europe failed to produce the results desired by those powers. Of course, it did make the popular masses' struggle more difficult and slowed it down to a

considerable extent, but the scope of the revolutionary movement was so great that even with extensive outside support, the internal counterrevolution could not prevent the march of revolutionary events.

The people's democratic revolutions developed differently in different East European countries, depending on the internal conditions in each of them and on the correlation of class forces. Diversity in the forms and methods of the socioeconomic transformations carried out by them was characteristic of these revolutions. In some countries, a more decisive victory was won, which opened up opportunities (as, for instance, in Bulgaria) for fulfilling the tasks of socialist revolution; in others, the people's revolution gradually gathered strength; and in others again, the national liberation struggle only just began to grow into a people's revolution, completing the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

In all cases it was the antifascist democratic character of the people's revolutions that was the first thing to manifest itself. In the countries where vestiges of feudalism were preserved, the revolutions assumed an antifeudal character. However, the orientation of all revolutions against the big industrial and financial capital that had discredited itself by cooperating with fascism invested them with a clear anti-imperialist and anticapitalist character.

The revolutions in East European countries progressed along an ascending line and scored one victory after another. However, it would be wrong to portray them in the same rosy colors. At times, extraordinarily complex and acute situations developed, there were objective and subjective difficulties, and, now and then, even grave errors and blunders were made that subsequently had to be paid for dearly and because of which considerable efforts had to subsequently be made to eliminate their consequences. In a number of cases, these errors resulted from an underestimation of scientific revolutionary theory or from the fact that the experience of the past revolutionary struggle had not been duly taken into account. Haste and hurry were often apparent in solving difficult tasks that required a longer time than one would want, and the consideration of all the complex internal and external factors, real possibilities, the level of political experience of the people and many other elements.

Among the bourgeois ideologues--and not only among them--one often encounters adherents of a one-sided elucidation of the history of the revolutions of the 1940s and of the subsequent development of the East European countries, as well as those who are partial to savoring and chewing on the topics that are primarily connected with the complicated political situations and difficulties in individual socialist countries such as, for instance, the counterrevolutionary uprising in Hungary in 1956, the political crisis in Czechoslovakia in 1968, or the difficult situation in Poland at the beginning of the 1980s.

A sufficiently complete and objective analysis of the reasons for the difficulties that appear along their path has always been a characteristic feature of communist policy. The Marxist-Leninists themselves precisely and clearly indicate the internal and external factors that cause complicated

political and economic situations and they plan and implement in practice the necessary measures to eliminate them.

However, the bourgeois ideologies, claiming to be "objective" and "unbiased" in their research of the problems of the socialist world, invariably reduce all of their attempts at "analysis" to proclaiming the false thesis about the "inefficiency of socialism," to exhortations regarding the renunciation of some kind of "Soviet model" of socialism, to calls for a return to private entrepreneurship and the like. And every time, be it a question of the difficulties toward the end of the 1940s or the problems of the 1980s, "interpreters" are invariably found who, encouraged by the special services of imperialism, focus public attention on their own invented version of the development of some events or other and to whom, naturally, it never even occurs to objectively analyze such events even to a very minimum extent. How can we fail to recall Lenin's words in this connection: "...The old method of the reactionaries is to first misinterpret socialism and ascribe to it absurdity, and then to triumphantly refute the absurdity!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 361). It is precisely this method that has been constantly used by imperialism and its ideological and propaganda apparatus during the entire period of the formation of socialism in Eastern Europe.

Regardless of completely explainable objective complications and difficulties that have at times been caused by subjective factors, the main direction of revolutions has led the peoples of those countries toward their common goal, preparations for the construction of the socialist society.

The active struggle, dynamism and mass character of popular actions in the East European states bore the main marks of political and social revolutions. At the same time, the revolutions of the 1940s also showed new forms and new methods of transition from capitalism to socialism. And although in different countries this transition passed through different stages that essentially differed from one another, this was nevertheless in every country one and the same revolutionary process from its source to its complete victory, a process opening up the road to socialism.

The revolutions of the 1940s and their progressive development confirmed the general laws that already became apparent in the October days of 1917. These laws concerned the transfer of power from one class to another and the fundamental changes in the economy, social relations, and in political, state and ideological spheres. However, the specific forms through which these general laws manifested themselves were in a number of cases different from the past revolutions preceding them, including the Great October Revolution. For instance, the people's authority was not established and consolidated through civil wars. In the first postwar years, the revolutions developed within the framework of the old state system. For instance, the monarchic systems were formally preserved for some time in Bulgaria, Hungary and Yugoslavia, and in Romania in actual fact, whereas in Czechoslovakia the system of the bourgeois republic was preserved for some time. However, this fact nevertheless did not determine the nature of the new people's authority that had asserted itself, and it could not hold back the revolutionary process.

The long duration and relatively peaceful nature of the transfer of power from one class to another were a distinctive feature of the revolutions of the 1940s. This transition itself was not a synchronous act. In a number of countries, the organs of people's authority began to be formed and to assert themselves already during the process of the liberation struggle and of clearing the national territories of the fascist occupation regimes.

The active participation of broad popular masses in the revolutions ensured a relatively peaceable path, and the entire severity of contradictions with the old system manifested itself in the class and political struggle.

However, the possibility of armed suppression of actions of the reaction was not excluded. The reaction made such attempts, for instance, in Romania, and counterrevolutionary uprisings were prepared in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. It was precisely for this reason that the communists took the appropriate countermeasures and that armed detachments of workers were formed. The presence of the Soviet forces in some East European countries, which made activation of the counterrevolutionary bourgeois forces impossible, played an enormous deterrent role in relation to the internal and external reaction.

And today, the general democratic and popular nature of the revolutions of the 1940s is even more obvious on the basis of the experience of 40 years of socialist construction by the communist and workers parties of those countries. The workers, peasants, intelligentsia, urban petty bourgeoisie, and a part of the bourgeoisie, that is, virtually all strata of society with the exception of big capitalists and landowners who had embarked on the path of national treason, united in every country in the struggle against the external enemy--German or Italian fascism and its local minions.

As early as in the course of the revolutions, the leaders of some of them, perceiving many common features of the revolutions in a number of countries and contrasting these features to the old bourgeois democracy, characterized--with this substantiation in mind--their only just formed (or more correctly, just forming) system as new democracy or as people's democracy, and the revolutions as people's democratic revolutions. Taking this definition with a certain amount of conditionality, especially in application to all of the revolutions of the 1940s, it does sufficiently reflect precisely their general democratic essence and their genuinely popular character.

People's democracy has entered the history of the revolutionary movement as a temporary and transitional form of the political system of society, a form that asserted itself in several East European countries as a result of the revolutions of the 1940s. Born as the revolutionary democratic authority of the workers class headed by the Marxist-Leninist party, people's democracy grew in the process of the revolution into one of the forms of dictatorship of the proletariat. In this way, in accordance with the general laws of socialist revolution and the characteristic specifically historical conditions in each of the countries involved, people's democracy prepared and ensured the transition to the construction of socialism.

The revolutions of the 1940s have much in common as regards their essence, their ideological-political basis, the main direction of their development, and their final goals, and they continue the path opened up by the Great October Revolution. As a result, in all East European countries, the political power was transferred to the workers class, social ownership of the means of production was established, and the national economy began to develop on planning principles. The class and socioeconomic essence of the transition from capitalism to socialism is the same in all revolutions. And, at the same time, each of the completed revolutions differs from others by the modes and ways and the forms and methods of the transformations that are common to all of them by their essence and goals.

The communist parties, actively fighting against fascism and suffering enormous losses in the struggle for democratic renewal and socialist renaissance of their countries, played the leading role in the revolutions of the 1940s. The authority of communists increased rapidly and their ranks grew and were strengthened. Within the shortest historical period, they grew into the most influential force in all East European countries.

The socialist construction plans worked out by the communists were programs for economic reconstruction. In only 2 postwar decades, industrial production increased, as compared with the prewar level, by 21 times in Bulgaria, 11 times in Poland, by nearly 10 times in Romania, by 7 times in Yugoslavia, 6 times in Hungary, by nearly 6 times in Czechoslovakia, and by more than 4 times in the GDR. The output of agricultural products increased significantly. Great changes were made in the management of the entire national economy and a transition was made to the new economic system of planning and management of industry and agriculture.

A majority of East European countries needed less than 2 decades to lay the foundations of socialist society. Those were the years of intensive labor, of liquidation of the grave consequences of the war, of restoration and development of the national economy on an essentially new socialist basis, and of formation and consolidation of new social relations. In the course of the fulfillment of subsequent five-year plans, the East European socialist countries became the world's most dynamic economic region. They outstripped the developed capitalist countries to a considerable extent by the growth rates of their national incomes and industrial production. The strengthening of socialism as a social system in those countries convincingly proved the progressive nature and vitality of socialism and opened up bright prospects of socioeconomic and cultural life for the peoples following the socialist road.

The successful development of revolutions in a number of European states and their transition to the path of socialist construction predetermined the formation of the world system of socialism. As the socialist system became more consolidated, the necessary prerequisites were created for strengthening the ties between the individual countries and for establishing and consolidating a new type of international relations. The socialist system was able to form itself in the course of progressive development of the world revolutionary process, as a result of the victory of revolutions in the countries with sizeable territories and populations, and as a result of the

establishment of firm economic, political, ideological and cultural relations among them.

A solid basis of friendship and cooperation between the peoples of fraternal countries was built as early as the first postwar years. This basis was their socioeconomic and political community: The countries of socialism had an economic basis of the same type, that is, social ownership of the means of production; a state system of the same type, that is, the power of the people headed by the workers class; and one and the same Marxist-Leninist ideology. They were united by their common interests in defending their revolutionary achievements and their national independence against the imperialist encroachments and by their common goal of building socialism and communism.

The formation and development of the world socialist system depended to a considerable extent on the socioeconomic and political transformations in the countries of people's democracy. The economic achievements prepared the ground for further strengthening the political system of socialist society and, at the same time, created the prerequisites for the formation and development of relations of comprehensive cooperation between the states that had chosen the path of socialism.

Great revolutionary events have always been and always will be a subject of profound interpretations by the succeeding generations. This also applies to the East European revolutions of the 20th century. Although 4 decades have already passed since their victories, interest in them and in the character and essence of various stages of the revolution has not waned. This is understandable.

What is involved in this connection is the fact that the complex, dynamic and, at times, contradictory process of revolutionary restructuring of the society cannot be comprehensively examined and fully recognized without taking into account ever newer and newer characteristics that appear within the range of examination of researchers. In addition to that, every new generation views the revolutionary past of its country through the prism of present and future tasks, striving to perceive in the revolution's origins its more remote plans of future goals. Furthermore, as the tasks of socialist construction are being fulfilled, the very image of real socialism and, consequently, of the revolution that prepared it, becomes increasingly precise and specific in conformity with the new experience.

And today, too, marking the 40th anniversaries of their revolutions and on the even of their next party congresses, the communists are turning to the sources of their experience in order to more effectively and clearly determine their future tasks. This is the essence of the Marxist-Leninist approach to solving complicated problems and of truly scientific prognostications of social development. For, as Lenin emphasized, the Marxist teaching "is the summing-up of experience under the light of a profoundly philosophical world outlook and rich knowledge of history" (op. cit., vol 33, p 29). The fraternal communist and workers parties continue to creatively develop Marxist-Leninism on the basis of a thorough scientific analysis and interpretation of the road traversed so far and by summing up the results of the historical experience accumulated by their own as well as other peoples of the community.

The summing up of the experience of the revolutionary past is especially important now, when the fraternal parties face the important and complex tasks of ensuring favorable internal and external conditions for their further peaceful socialist construction. The past 40 years have demonstrated that the greatest attention should be devoted to utilizing the entire wealth of collective experience in building socialism in the fraternal countries, and that all aspects of this experience, both positive and negative, should be carefully taken into account.

The experience of the revolutions of the 1940s and of the subsequent socialist development in the East European countries is wide and multifaceted. The revolutions and the subsequent development have convincingly confirmed the correctness of the theoretical tenets of Leninism and their continuity in relation to the October Revolution and the CPSU's experience. At the same time, they have brought much that is new to the theory and practice of world socialism. This primarily concerns the conditions and forms through which the power has been won; the correlation between the general laws and the specific historical and national characteristics of building socialism; the development of the state forms and political systems under socialism; the motivating forces and allies in the revolution; the forms and methods of socialist transformation of the individual economic branches; the essence and duration of the transition period between capitalism and socialism; and so forth.

There are two aspects of the revolutionary experience that are closely related to the aforementioned ones and which not only have played a special role during the revolutions and the subsequent period, but also continue to represent the most important conditions for the further advance of the countries of socialism along the path of social progress and peace. These two aspects are a higher role of the conscious and real activeness of the masses and a strengthening of the unity of actions of the fraternal socialist states.

The revolutions of the 1940s proved in practice in the insolvency and fallaciousness of the reformist and revisionist claims about a notorious "incompatibility" of revolution and democracy.

They awakened enormous masses of the people, including many who had previously been passive observers, to real political activeness. The wide and direct participation of the working people in solving the most important questions of social life ensured a radical and comprehensive reorganization of the socioeconomic and political life in the East European countries.

Lenin's characterization of the soviets formed during the 1905 revolution is fully applicable to this aspect of experience of the revolutions of the 1940s: "The new authority, as the dictatorship of an enormous majority, could and did sustain itself exclusively with the assistance of the trust of enormous masses, exclusively by the fact that it attracted, in the freest, widest and strongest way, the entire mass to the participation in power" (op. cit., vol 12, pp 318-319).

The close interdependence between the solution of political and economic problems on the one hand, and the broad development of socialist democracy and

an increase in the effectiveness of all of its institutions and forms on the other, clearly manifested itself in the process of revolutionary transformations in the East European countries, and especially during the period of socialist construction. Economic tasks cannot be fulfilled without a widened participation of the working masses in the administration of political and economic life and without their greater awareness and interest in the results of production, in strengthening socialism in each individual country and in deepening the cooperation between the fraternal states. The further perfecting of the political system of the society is indissolubly connected with this, and this in its turn presupposes a greater leading role of the party, the development of social awareness of the masses and greater social activeness.

Casting a mental look back at the past 4 decades, the peoples of the fraternal countries are deeply aware of the importance of their close mutual cooperation and of the necessity of constantly strengthening the unity of the socialist community as a whole at all stages of their path. As early as during the first postwar years under the conditions of the "cold war" waged by the imperialist circles, the states that had embarked on the path of building socialism faced the task of uniting their efforts to protect the revolutionary achievements against the encroachments of international reaction that tried to restore the previous systems in Eastern Europe.

As the internal situation in the people's democratic countries became consolidated, opportunities increased for active mutual counteractions against the policy of the Western powers. The declaration of the conference of representatives of the communist and workers parties of nine European states, held in Poland in September 1947, noted: "If the communists stand firmly on their positions, if they refuse to be intimidated or blackmailed, if they valiantly stand guard over democracy, national sovereignty, freedom and the independence of their countries, and if, in the struggle against attempts at economic and political enslavement of their countries, they are able to lead all forces that are ready to defend the cause of honor and national independence, then no plans for the enslavement of European and Asian countries can be realized."

The action unity of the countries of socialism and their comprehensive cooperation have ensured and continue to ensure the solutions of the problems of internal development and the fulfillment of the tasks of defense against the plans of imperialism and of preservation of peace and international security. In the 1980s, world tension has sharply increased through the fault of the most reactionary aggressive circles of imperialism, including primarily the United States, and the threat of nuclear annihilation of human civilization has intensified even more. Under these conditions, the struggle to prevent nuclear war and lower the level of military confrontation represents the most important task of countries of the socialist community and of all progressive and peace-loving forces of our planet.

The exacerbation of international tension and the necessity of protecting the countries of socialism and the entire civilization of the earth against the threat of a nuclear missile war demand the further political, economic and military cohesion of the fraternal countries and an intensification of their

interaction. The words uttered by Lenin more than 60 years ago are particularly topical today: "...We who are fighting against imperialism represent an alliance that requires a close military cohesion, and we consider all attempts at undermining this cohesion as something absolutely impermissible, as a betrayal of the interests of the struggle against international imperialism" (op. cit., vol 40, pp 98-99).

The political and economic strengthening of each individual socialist country closely linked with the consolidation of the community as a whole, represents the most important condition for successful counteraction against the aggressive policy of imperialism. The 1984 Moscow Economic Conference of CEMA member countries at the highest level, which opened up new prospects of economic development and mutual cooperation of the fraternal countries, represented an important step in ensuring firm resistance against imperialist pressures on socialism.

The question of strengthening the action unity of countries of the socialist community is constantly at the center of attention of the communist and workers parties and governments of the fraternal states. Speaking at the Kremlin reception in honor of participants in the Economic Conference on 14 June 1984, Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed the aspirations of those countries to further continue to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the fraternal parties and states and make their cooperation even closer and more effective.

Four decades have passed since the beginning of the people's revolutions in Eastern Europe. The interest in that stormy and difficult period is not weakening. On the contrary, the historical significance of the revolutions of the 1940s is felt even more distinctly. They opened up the path of social progress for the peoples of that region, continued the road to socialism, and changed the entire political situation in Europe, and soon--after the victory of the people's revolutions in China, Vietnam and Korea--in the entire world as well. The formation and development of a world socialist system began.

The strengthening of the world socialist community, the growth of the international authority and influence of socialism and its impact on contemporary social life--all this has become a real alternative to the capitalist system and has demonstrated that socialism has turned into an objective condition and an urgent requirement for the further development and progress of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984.

CSO: 1802/6

WHO IS PREVENTING PEACE IN AFRICA?

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 84-95

[Article by Dr of Historical Sciences Ye. Tarabrin]

[Text] The building of a new life in the liberated African countries is inseparable both from the processes of developing national statehood and the establishment of friendly good-neighborly cooperation among them. In the words of V. I. Lenin, these countries, which number hundreds of millions of people, "have remained outside history and are considered only as a historical object" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 233). Today they have emerged in the world arena as subjects with full rights. Their role and prestige in world affairs have increased sharply and intergovernmental contacts in the African continent have become an inseparable component of the system of international relations.

Actually, the establishment of intergovernmental relations in African took place simultaneously with the breakdown of colonial empires and in the course of a sharp struggle against the legacy of the past. Their development was and is positively influenced by the movement for true national liberation strengthening independence and sovereignty and economic and social, progress. As in international relations as a whole, relations among governments in Africa reflect the influence of unabating class battles on our planet.

The specific nature and features of inter-African relations are greatly determined by the confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction on the regional and global scale, embodied in the sociopolitical differentiation of African countries, the conflicting trends of internal development, foreign policy orientation and the aggravation of the class struggle. The forces which favor strengthening the acquired freedom and independence, attaining economic autonomy and promoting peace and opposing the threat of nuclear war are opposed on the continent by aggressive imperialist circles who are grossly interfering in the internal affairs of African countries and are trying to impose upon them the West's neocolonial rule by all possible means.

As Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, pointed out, the peoples which rejected the yoke of colonial dependence and took the path of independent development are frequently "forced to repel the attacks of aggressive imperialist sources,

which create most dangerous hotbeds of bloody violence and military conflagrations in one part of the world or another." These words fully describe the circumstances in which inter-African cooperation is taking shape and developing.

I

Intergovernmental relations in Africa are distinguished by their great dynamism. In no more than 20 years, a system of political interrelationships has developed between countries, which gained their independence, on a bilateral, regional and continental level. Virtually nowhere else in the world has this process occurred at such a fast pace. Inter-African relations acquired their international legal form with the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was founded in 1963 and is supported by the overwhelming majority of countries and the United Nations as a whole. Today it includes all 50 liberated countries on the continent: republics, monarchies, countries which chose the revolutionary-democratic path and a socialist orientation after their liberations, and countries which cultivate the capitalist order and trail in the fairway of imperialist policy. The African countries are characterized by the uneven processes of the establishment of statehood, differences in economic conditions and availability of natural resources, and specific national features and traditions, which cannot fail to increase their growing differentiation. Politically, such differentiation, based less on the national than the class principle, is historically legitimate and is defined by the confrontation between the two social development trends--socialism and capitalism. It is indicative that approximately one-quarter of all independent states in the continent today have chosen a socialist orientation.

Problems inherited from the colonial past, acting like "delayed-action mines" are a strictly negative factor in African intergovernmental relations. They include problems of the boundaries separating many countries, the existence of considerable numbers of refugees, competing production sectors deliberately encouraged by foreign monopolies and the use which the former mother countries make of their positions in strengthening their influence on a neocolonialist basis.

The great economic backwardness of the African countries is a large "minefield" in which "explosions" occur here and there. The imperialists use it as one of the levers for pressuring such countries with a view to preventing their reciprocal cooperation and preserving the possibility of exploiting and plundering their natural resources. Let us remember that the leading capitalist countries meet 90 percent of their needs for diamonds, 80 percent of their needs for cobalt and gold, 62 percent for platinum, 37 percent for copper and 33 percent for phosphates with imports from Africa.

Naturally, the desire of the independent African countries, based on their tremendous natural and human resources, to achieve economic emancipation, is encountering stubborn imperialist opposition. Using the "stick and carrot" method, they are doing everything possible to undermine the independent economic development of the African countries and to maintain them in the status of dependent clients and raw material and fuel suppliers. It is

precisely the policy of the imperialist countries which is the main obstruction to strengthening the sovereignty and economic independence and the socioeconomic progress of the young African countries freed from direct colonial rule. That is why, all disagreements among them notwithstanding (disagreements, mainly, rather than antagonisms), which change and assume different forms and characters, the joint objectives of the struggle against imperialism bring together the truly patriotic forces and strengthen their cohesion and unity, which are a mandatory prerequisite for success in surmounting the consequences of the colonial past. Typically, the extraordinary meeting of the Assembly of Heads of States and Governments of OAU Members, which was held in Lagos (Nigeria) in 1980, to discuss problems of economic development, bluntly stated that their objectives could be attained only by expanding comprehensive cooperation among independent countries on the subregional and continental levels. In this connection, we must recall the words of Kwame Nkrumah, the great son of Africa. In his book "I Speak of Freedom," he wrote that "it is clear that we must find the solution to our problems by ourselves. This solution lies in the unity among African countries. If we are divided we are weak...."

In recent times the centripetal trends in intergovernmental relations in the continent have been helped by a growing understanding of the importance of the struggle against the threat of nuclear war and for peace, international security, disarmament and settling conflicts through political means. The African countries are becoming increasingly involved in international life. They account for nearly one-third of the entire UN membership, and for more than one-half of the nonaligned countries. The independent African countries are most consistent, naturally, in matters affecting them directly, such as the elimination of the shameful apartheid regime in the southern part of the continent, the liberation of Namibia, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Africa, the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean and its conversion into a zone of peace, and forbidding the creation of imperialist military bases and sites on their territory. The increased resolve of the African countries to play an active positive role in maintaining and consolidating universal peace and security is confirmed by their contribution to the proceedings of the Seventh Conference of Nonaligned Countries, which was held in New Delhi, and the 38th and 39th UN General Assembly sessions.

II

The resolve of achieving the liberation of the peoples in the southern part of the continent from the oppression of the racist regime and granting freedom to Namibia is an important contributing factor to the unity of independent African countries. All OAU decisions made on the level of ministers of foreign affairs and heads of state and governments of members of the organization firmly condemn the shameful system of apartheid and the racial oppression of the African majority in the Republic of South Africa, hold up to shame the illegal occupation of Namibia and emphasize the need to increase all-round aid to the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people--the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO), the African National Congress (ANC) and other liberation movements in South Africa. On the initiative of the African countries, these views were expanded in the political declaration adopted at the Seventh Conference of Nonaligned

Countries, in New Delhi, and in the resolutions on problems of decolonization and the situation in South Africa, approved by the UN General Assembly.

The situation in the southern part of the continent, which has assumed the nature of a grave clash between the liberated countries and the racist Republic of South Africa, plays a particular role in inter-African relations. It is based on imperialism's aspiration to retain an enclave of apartheid and racism, to crush the ANC and SWAPO, to destabilize progressive regimes in neighboring countries and to establish neocolonialist control over them.

Several interrelated problems may be singled out in the South African conflict. The first is the very existence of a frenzied racist regime and the enslavement of 80 percent of the black and colored population by the white minority. Second is the illegal occupation of Namibia by South African armed forces. Third is the liberation struggle waged in the southern part of Africa by progressive forces, headed by the communist party and the ANC and, in Namibia, SWAPO. Fourth are the armed actions and subversive activities of the Republic of South Africa directed against Angola, Mozambique and other neighboring countries. Suffice it to say that between 1976 and 1984 the South African racists have engaged in no less than 1,500 armed provocations against Angola. Fifth, the open support which imperialism, the United States above all, is giving the racist regime and the actual establishment of an aggressive alliance between Washington and Pretoria, officially described as a "constructive cooperation" agreement. All of these problems, jointly or separately, are reflected in African intergovernmental relations.

The "confrontation countries"--Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia and Tanzania, and Zimbabwe, which joined them in 1980, assumed the most active stance in relations with the racist regime and its expansionism starting with the mid-1970s. This sui generis military-political and diplomatic alliance is an outstanding phenomenon in the system of intergovernmental relations on the continent. The participating countries, although not signatories to a formal military aid treaty, hold regular conferences and consultations on the governmental level. Qualifying the escalation of Pretoria's aggressive actions as "undeclared war," the purpose of which is to destabilize the countries in the area, to increase their dependence on the Republic of South Africa and to delay granting independence to Namibia and the liberation of the South African people, the participants in these conferences called for increased coordination of their defense efforts in order to force the racists to withdraw without delay their forces from Angola and Namibia. The decision was also made to give increasing support to SWAPO and the ANC so that they may intensify their armed struggle for national liberation.

This position assumed by the "confrontation states" is exerting a positive influence on all other independent African countries. One of the results of this influence was the outcome of the regular meeting of the OAU Commission on Defense Problems, which was held in Accra, the Ghanaian capital, by the end of January. Representatives of 26 African countries sharply condemned the aggressive policy of the RSA and expressed their readiness to confront it with a united front. They passed a declaration stipulating that RSA aggression and destabilizing actions will be firmly rebuffed with "joint force." A protocol was drawn up in this connection on the creation of pan-African defense forces

under the aegis of the OAU, and an OAU military council as the supreme joint military command for Africa.

In addition to political contacts, the "confrontation states" are strengthening their economic relations, involving other countries in this process. As a counterbalance to the racist idea of creating an economic "galaxy of countries," headed by Pretoria, in the southern part of Africa, a "counterorganization" was set up in 1980--the South African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC). This economic association included all "confrontation states" as well as Lesotho, Swaziland and Malawi. Everything indicates that the range of its participants will increase for economic as well as political reasons.

The actual dead end of the talks on granting independence to Namibia, caused by the Republic of South Africa and the United States, and the open support given by the American administration to the South African leadership and the increased aggressiveness of the racists brought about qualitative changes in the alliance of "confrontation states," and a significant energizing of their diplomatic activities. One impetus for this was the fact that, ignoring Resolution 435 of the UN Security Council on Namibia, Pretoria and Washington are trying to "link" this question to the presence in Angola (as requested by its government and entirely in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter) of a small contingent of Cuban forces which, incidentally, are deployed more than 200 kilometers away from the border separating Angola from Namibia. The purpose of this "link" is to delay the liberation of Namibia and to weaken Angola. It has no juridical grounds whatsoever and constitutes an inadmissible intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign country. Characteristically, this "idea" is not supported even by the U.S. NATO allies. However, the use of this "link" has another aspect as well. In the plans of Washington and Pretoria, the purpose of such tactics is to introduce a division in inter-African relations and to weaken the unity among independent countries.

The racists and their patron are relying on the fact that someone in Africa would yield either to pressure or to promises and will support the idea of the "linkage," thus originating a new reason for quarrels and conflicts on the continent. It is no accident that this is just about the most frequently discussed topic in talks with African leaders by the numerous White House envoys visiting Africa. It became the topic of sharp discussions at the January 1983 regular Afro-American conference held in Harar (Zimbabwe). The U.S. "circuit brigade," 150 strong, including members of congress, high government officials, church leaders and journalists, urged, jointly and separately, the representatives of 30 African states to agree with the need for "linkage." These efforts, however, proved to be futile. At the 38th UN General Assembly session all African countries voted in favor of the Namibian resolution, which rejected South African and U.S. efforts to establish a link or a parallel between Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

The influence of the South African conflict situation on intergovernmental relations in Africa is determined by a number of circumstances. The principal among them are the level of military confrontation between the individual

countries and the racist regime; the extent and forms of their economic dependence on the RSA; consistency in their support of national liberation movements; their specific domestic situation. Let us consider in this connection the agreements respectively signed by Angola and Mozambique with the Republic of South Africa, which drew great attention both in Africa and throughout the world. The first deals with pulling back Angolan and South African forces from the border with Namibia and the withdrawal of the racist occupation corps from the Angolan south. Mozambique signed a nonaggression agreement with the Republic of South Africa, according to which Pretoria undertook to terminate its support of gangs of the counterrevolutionary Mozambique National Resistance (MNR) which are committing excesses on Mozambique territory.

The attitude of the independent African countries toward these accords was expressed at the 40th session of the Council of OAU Ministers. The resolution adopted at the session stipulated that the ministers of foreign affairs express their sympathy for and understanding of the diplomatic efforts made by the Angolan and Mozambique governments, aimed at preserving their independence and national sovereignty. However, it could not be ignored that such accords did not cover the main explosive problems of southern Africa--the elimination of the apartheid and racist regime in the Republic of South Africa and the liberation of Namibia. Great doubts are also expressed regarding the sincerity of Pretoria, to which the purpose of such agreements was mainly to break its international isolation. We must also point out that these actions had a fourth participant--the Reagan administration--which claimed "mediation success" for these agreements. A uniform view exists on this subject. The White House needs to pose as "peace-maker" in order to be able somehow to whitewash its criminal alliance with the South African racists.

The natural question which the public of the overwhelming majority of countries on the continent asks itself is the following: Has anything changed in the southern part of Africa? Encouraged by the imperialists, MNR gangs in Mozambique have no intention of laying down their arms as they pursue their subversive actions. South African troops continue to occupy part of Angola's territory in violation of the agreement. At the same time, pressure is being applied on Angola. Envoys from Pretoria and the White House are increasing their meetings with Savimbi, the leader of the counterrevolutionary UNITA group. The recently performed constitutional farce in the RSA did not affect the foundations of apartheid. As the resolution approved at the 39th UN General Assembly Session stipulated, a new "wave of violence and assassinations" of striking working people and demonstrators was its direct consequence.

Characteristically, the South African maneuvers triggered no enthusiasm even among the leadership of Western European socialist and social democratic parties. The meeting of the Socialist International Bureau, which was held in Denmark at the end of April, was a clear confirmation of this fact. Thus, in opening the proceedings, A. Jorgensen, the chairman of the Danish Social Democratic Party, sharply condemned U.S. and British policy in the south of Africa. He called for a universal international economic and trade boycott of Pretoria's racist regime, support of the SADCC and increased aid to SWAPO and ANC forces. "Apartheid cannot be legitimized or adapted to present

conditions. There is either apartheid or majority rule," Jorgensen pointed out. "The South African military-industrial complex has gained significant strength as a result of silent British and U.S. support."

This was one more failure of the hopes of the South African rulers and their ally across the ocean. The antiracist unity of free Africa, despite all of Pretoria's maneuverings and the traps set by the neocolonizers, has remained generally intact. There is an increasing belief in the continent also in the fact that the easing of the dangerous situation in the southern part of Africa would bring about qualitatively new positive changes in the entire system of intergovernmental relations among independent African countries.

III

A variety of disputes and conflicts significantly hinder the creation of a favorable political climate in Africa and the development of a solid reliable system of relations among countries in the continent and their true unity. Unfortunately, such negative phenomena are widespread. Since 1960--the year of African liberation--more than 50 clashes among countries have taken place on the continent, many of them military. Although their direct reasons may vary, all of them are the reflection of objective as well as secondary and tertiary subjective contradictions. Most of them were inherited by the liberated countries from the colonial past. Naturally, each conflict which breaks out between liberated African countries has specific historical grounds. However, it breaks out precisely wherever the forces of imperialism and its accomplices are trying to suppress by force the national liberation movement, turn the wheel of history back and erect obstacles on the path of the independent development of countries, above all those which have chosen a progressive orientation and hold anti-imperialist positions in their foreign policy. Extensive proof exists of the fact that the imperialists are doing everything possible to interfere in the differences which exist or break out among African countries and try to make them develop into grave conflicts. In frequent cases they artificially create hotbeds of tension for the sake of implementing their expansionistic plans concerning individual countries. By applying the "divide and rule" principle, the imperialists are trying to acquire a "free hand" for armed intervention in the internal affairs of African countries and to support regimes which provide a favorable climate for the predatory activities of multinational corporations.

The imperialist tactic of "conflicts" also calls for the use of neocolonialist agents in weakening the role and influence of the young independent countries in the international arena. The main targets of such tactics are countries with a progressive orientation. The purpose of involving them in a variety of conflicts is to discredit the policy of peace pursued by these countries, to weaken their anti-imperialist potential, to prevent the intensification of revolutionary changes and, along the way, to spoil the cooperation between African, and not only the progressive, countries and the socialist states. In the final account, this "conflict" tactic of imperialism is aimed at undermining the still weak system of intergovernmental relations in independent Africa, based on unity and cohesion. This possibility is particularly tempting to the imperialists, for this system is not limited to the African continent but is also reflected in the work of the main

international organizations--the United Nations and the nonaligned movement. Naturally, the imperialists are unwilling to face a united front of liberated countries, whether in Africa or in the international arena.

Discord within the family of African nations worsens the general situation in the continent and draws the forces and means of the liberated countries away from the solution of basic vital political, economic and social problems and hinders the normal functioning of their economic intergovernmental associations. Something else should be emphasized as well: objective studies indicate that the overwhelming majority of conflicts in independent Africa could be eliminated quickly and successfully through peaceful means, without outside imperialist intervention. This is confirmed by the fact alone that in recent years, despite neocolonialist intrigues, a number of conflicts in Africa have been successfully settled, greatly to the credit of the OAU.

Nevertheless, many difficult and explosive situations remain. One of them is in the area of the Horn of Africa and somewhat south of it. This applies above all to the illegal territorial claims of Somali toward Ethiopia, Kenya and Djibouti and differences between Kenya and Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda, and Tanzania and Uganda. The second center of contradictions is in central and west Africa, covering the confrontation between Chad and Ghana, and Zaire and Nigeria-Cameroon relations. The third center is in northwest Africa, related to the problem of the southern Sahara.

In particular, taking as an example the tragic events in the Horn of Africa, where the armed conflict has assumed a protracted and dangerous nature, the subversive imperialist tactics have become clearly apparent. It is precisely Washington which has made tremendous efforts to fan the war in this area. In urging on the Somali ruling circles to mount armed operations against Ethiopia, the purpose of the United States was the abolishment of the revolutionary regime in Ethiopia and to clear the way to achieving its expansionist aspirations. Having urged on Mogadishu to engage in a senseless military adventure, the United States used the chauvinistic zeal of the Somali rulers to turn the country into a Pentagon bridgehead in order to secure access to its air and naval bases.

Other examples of conflict-worsening indirect and direct imperialist intervention could be cited in terms of the situation in the Western Sahara, Ghana, the borders between Mali and Burkina Faso and between Zaire and Zambia and, particularly, the events in Chad. France, the United States and several other countries openly intervened in the new outbreak of civil war in that country and in the armed conflict among opposing political groups. They are trying to use this domestic conflict in order to impose upon the Chadian people a neocolonialist order and achieve long-range military-political intentions aimed at regaining their domination over this important African area.

It is indicative that a large number of conflicts break out and are encouraged in areas containing mineral raw material deposits. Chad, for example, has rich mineral deposits, including uranium and petroleum. The territorial disputes between Mali and Burkina Faso are worsened by the fact that the "disputed area" has manganese, titanium, petroleum and natural gas deposits.

The conflict in South Sahara is greatly related to the existence of phosphate, copper and iron ore deposits and promising sources of petroleum and natural gas. Overseas ore mining companies and the companies of some Western European countries are laying a claim to the natural resources of these and other African countries. Let us recall in this connection that the mother countries frequently drew the boundaries separating their colonial possessions between the then-discovered mineral deposit areas. Many political boundaries were "geological" boundaries as well. It has been noted, for example, that Mozambique's territory starts at the precise point where South Africa's "underground pantry" ends. Today the struggle among monopolies for sources of fuel-energy and mineral raw materials is encouraging conflicts among African countries.

However, the greatest threat to the normal working of the system of intergovernmental relations in Africa and a threat of the escalation of local conflicts into global clashes is related, as we read in the Prague Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact members, to attempts at directly or indirectly involving African countries in imperialist military-political alliances and extending to them the realm of action of the blocs. There have been abundant manifestations of this policy in Africa. Based on initialed agreements, the Pentagon is using and modernizing existing and building new bases in Egypt, Morocco, Sudan, Somali, Kenya, Djibouti and Zaire. The area of the "central command," which was set up by the United States at the start of 1983, includes 19 countries, six of them in East Africa. French military units, consisting of thousands of soldiers and officers, are stationed in many African countries. The arms race on the continent is continuing. What kind of stability could one speak about under such circumstances?

We know that there are no regional problems which cannot be resolved by peaceful means. Naturally, however, provided that all vestiges of colonial oppression and racism have been eliminated and neocolonialist exploitation abandoned. As to Africa, the Soviet Union has invariably encouraged improvements in the entire political situation on the continent. It finds no problems which could not be settled through talks, in accordance with United Nations and OAU principles, in which the Africans themselves should play a decisive role in the process.

IV

The Organization of African Unity, which is an important instrument in the anti-imperialist and anticolonial struggle, has made a great contribution to eliminating the domination of the colonizers on the continent, strengthening the unity, cohesion and cooperation among its peoples, defending the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African countries, settling their disputes peacefully and organizing a system of intergovernmental relations.

Currently the efforts of the OAU are focused on resolving the problem of the liberation of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia from racist oppression, helping the liberated countries to surmount economic and social backwardness and developing inter-African economic and political cooperation. Greater

attention is being paid to the struggle against the threat of war and for disarmament and international security.

However, one cannot ignore the major difficulties present in OAU activities and the existence of centrifugal trends in its ranks. In addition to the above-mentioned processes of socioeconomic and political differentiation among participating members, they are also due to subversive imperialist actions aimed at destabilizing the situation on the continent, many parts of which have been proclaimed "vital interest" areas by Washington. In recent years, the efforts of Western imperialist circles to divide the OAU or turn it into a helpless organization dealing with secondary matters only have become substantially energized.

Imperialism, U.S. imperialism above all, is trying to impose upon the African countries a system of intergovernmental relations consistent with the interests of neocolonialism and subordinate to the protection of the capitalist order. This system is based on the long obsolete myths of the "absence" and "disappearance" of classes and class struggle in African and florid phraseology on the "originality" of African society, to the objective development of which revolutionary energy, revolutionary creativity and the revolutionary initiative of the masses are allegedly "alien."

In the words of M. Kerekou, Benin's president, imperialism is resorting to various tricks to divide the OAU. The purpose of such actions is to delay decisions which may be made by the leaders of the African countries on most important problems of our time, such as granting Namibia independence and settling the situation in the southern part of Africa, the Middle East and Western Sahara.... We are dealing with a vast international conspiracy aimed at dividing the OAU and destabilizing progressive and revolutionary regimes on the continent."

The understanding is growing in Africa of the unquestionable truth that the true interests of the African peoples urgently demand the preservation of the unity among liberated countries and the energizing of their joint activities against imperialism, racism and Zionism and the neocolonialist plunder of the continent's natural resources. As D. Moi, the president of Kenya, pointed out, "an Africa divided by internal contradictions, could easily fall prey to external exploiting forces." The major circumstance that despite OAU differences the factors which unite the countries and peoples of Africa are far superior to those which divide them is taken into consideration as well.

As a result of the efforts made by realistically thinking African leaders, the 19th Session of the Assembly of Heads of States and Governments of OAU Member Countries was held in the Ethiopian capital in June 1983. The resolutions which were passed once again called for the immediate liberation of Namibia. The activities of the "confrontation group" were condemned and the linkage between the solution of the Namibian problem and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was categorically rejected. As always, the United States was sharply criticized for its pandering to the racists. The main result of the session, however, was the resolve shown in Addis Ababa by the African countries to strengthen their political sovereignty and intergovernmental relations despite subversive imperialist activities.

The results of the 40th Session of the Council of OAU Ministers, which was held in February-March, were another clear manifestation of this resolve. The then-chairman Haile-Mariam Mengistu presented a realistic picture of the political and economic situation on the continent, particularly emphasizing that the responsibility for the problems the African continent faces is mainly that of imperialism. "...As long as prompt and corresponding measures have not been taken to restrain the impudent efforts of imperialist and reactionary forces," he said, "as the events in Grenada confirm, they will continue to suppress the freedom of the peoples and to create obstacles to their chosen way of development, thus undermining the process of upgrading the well-being of the peoples and detente."

The session dealt extensively with the situation in the south of Africa. The participants used sharp terms to characterize the aggressive policy of the racist South African regime toward the "confrontation states," and pointed out the obstacles erected to prevent the implementation of Resolution 435 of the UN Security Council on Namibia. Once again they noted the unacceptable linkage of the problem of its independence with the withdrawal of the contingent of Cuban forces from Angola.

Interim OAU Secretary General P. Onou emphasized the need for OAU members to draft a new strategy in the struggle against the apartheid regime in South Africa. This regime, as the ministers of foreign affairs noted in the adopted resolution, "enjoys comprehensive support of many Western countries, the United States and Britain above all, as well as Israel.... The African countries sharply condemned said states and the multinational corporations and some international financial institutions for their complicity with Pretoria, which enables the racists to remain in power."

Another example of the aspiration of OAU members to strengthen their unity was the session of the special OAU committee, which was held at the end of April. It discussed the question of creating a political security council of the OAU which would institute a system of collective security on the continent and could take fast and efficient steps to settle conflicts and to repel any aggression against the members of the organization.

The 20th Session of the Assembly of Heads of States and Governments, which was held in Addis Ababa in November revealed the aspiration of the overwhelming majority of liberated African countries to preserve and strengthen the unity and cohesion within their ranks in the struggle for strengthening political independence and achieving economic autonomy. The resolve of the African peoples to pursue the road of social and economic development, firmly to oppose the subversive intrigues of South Africa and outside imperialist forces, to achieve the immediate liberation of Namibia and to increase the aid given the "confrontation states" and the national liberation movements in the south of Africa was reflected in the speeches delivered by Haile-Mariam Mengistu and his successor to the OAU presidency, Tanzanian President J. Nyerere and other participants in the session, and in the adopted documents.

The OAU has acquired considerable positive experience in promoting unity among the countries on the continent, organizing friendly relations among them and

repelling imperialist attempts on their freedom and sovereignty. "We note with satisfaction," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said, "that in recent times this organization of independent African countries has been energetically trying to surmount the difficulties created by the enemies of its unity." Unquestionably, the OAU will continue to promote the unity and cohesion among African peoples in their struggle for peace, security and independence. Its long experience proves that the future belongs to the centripetal trends within the OAU.

V

As an inseparable structural component of overall international relations, intergovernmental relations in Africa are experiencing the influence of the entire set of global events. The increased international tension and the aggravation of circumstances in the world, triggered by the energizing of aggressive imperialist forces, are adversely affecting the situation in the African continent as well. The imperialist circles, the United States above all, are pursuing a particularly active policy of force, pressure, diktat and interference in African domestic affairs. They are trying, as was pointed out in the Prague Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact Members, to consolidate and divide their "spheres of influence." These circles are trying to turn to their own benefit any friction or complication which develops in relations among African countries. They are following the line of dividing and pitting some countries against others and are supporting the bulwark of racism and apartheid in the southern part of the continent.

This policy is opposed by the course charted by the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth, aimed at preserving and strengthening peace and detente, restraining the arms race, safeguarding the sovereign rights and freedoms of the peoples and developing equal, mutually profitable comprehensive political and economic cooperation among all countries, large and small. Both in general and specific problems of African reality, our country is on the side of the peoples of Africa in their aspiration to strengthen their national independence and eliminate the vestiges of colonialism. It is actively helping them to counter imperialist pressure. The USSR has no interests in Africa whatsoever which would conflict with the expectations of the Africans themselves.

The Soviet Union is defending firmly and consistently the rights and interests of African nations. At all international forums, including the United Nations, our country has invariably demanded the adoption of decisive measures and application of comprehensive sanctions against the aggressive racist South African regime. The programmatic documents of the CPSU stipulate that the total elimination of all hotbeds of colonialism and racism should be considered a most important international task. The Soviet government has given and will continue to give the necessary support to the struggle waged by the patriots in Namibia and South Africa, who, headed by SWAPO and the ANC, are defending their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

Friendly relations between the Soviet Union and many African countries, including relations based on long-term friendship and cooperation treaties, have been extensively developed between the Soviet Union and many African

countries in recent years. They are enriching and enhancing contacts among the countries. The relations of equality which exist between our country and the liberated African countries help to upgrade their role and prestige in the international arena.

The Soviet Union fully supports the demands of the African and other liberated countries on the restructuring of their economic relations with capitalist states on an equal and just basis. The USSR bases its economic relations with the independent African countries strictly on the principles of total equality. Its objective is maximally to contribute to the solution of the basic national economic problems of the young countries and to assist them in building their new life.

The African countries urgently need a peaceful and calm international situation and political stability. It is only under the conditions of a stable and reliable peace that they can resolve their problems. In this they are given tremendous support by the Soviet Union, which considers safeguarding universal peace its basic foreign policy task. The struggle for peace means anti-imperialism in its most specific manifestation. It is directly related to the solution of important international problems, such as eliminating all vestiges of colonial oppression, violations of the equality and independence of the peoples through the means and methods of neocolonialism, and the elimination of all hotbeds of colonialism and racism.

It is no accident that the policy pursued by the Soviet Union toward African countries is meeting with the increasing opposition of imperialist forces and those allied to them, who refuse to acknowledge that liberation movements arise and develop on national soil. Lenin wrote that the revolution "cannot be made by order or by agreement," and that "only fools or provocateurs" could think otherwise ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works, vol 36, p 457]).

Through its entire African policy, the Soviet Union is helping to create on the continent a peaceful atmosphere, a climate of reciprocal trust, cooperation, expansion of good-neighborly relations and elimination of fratricidal wars from the life of African society. This approach is a clear manifestation of the internationalism of our policy, which is helping to enhance Africa's role in world affairs and to strengthen intergovernmental contacts on the continent.

Intergovernmental relations in Africa are a new phenomenon in world politics. Their establishment and development is accompanied by many difficulties, struggle of ideas, clashes among different social forces and positive and negative influences of external factors. Their main content, however, is determined by the irrepressible aspiration of the peoples and countries on the continent for true independence, the fastest possible elimination of the consequences of the colonial past, the uprooting of all vestiges of colonialism and racism and freedom from neocolonialist exploitation. They are motivated to achieve this both by objective requirements, basic national interests and aspirations toward faster social progress, as well as the

resolve to make a worthy contribution to the solution of the global problems of mankind, the safeguarding and strengthening of universal peace and security above all.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

YEAR 1984. THE MOST IMPORTANT TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 96-107

[Article by Yu. Molchanov and V. Nekrasov]

[Text] The most important global trend in 1984 was, as in the past, the acceleration of social progress of mankind, characteristic of our age, and the increased power of socialism, which is increasingly showing its inexhaustible possibilities and basic advantages over capitalism. The attractiveness of the example of the socialist system and its priceless historical experience continued to increase. Life contributed ever new convincing proof of the decisive impact of socialism on the course of international events. The homeland of real socialism and the most powerful country of our time--the Soviet Union--and the other members of the socialist community continued to play a determining role in these processes, acting in world affairs as the generator and defender of healthy principles and peaceful human ideals.

All aspects of the political and socioeconomic life of the land of the soviets were imbued with purposefulness and consistency in the struggle for implementing the tasks of building socialism and communism and the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. The work of the party's Central Committee plenums, which creatively enriched the political course of the USSR, a course of construction and peace, was distinguished by its innovative approach to existing problems and tested and comprehensively weighed decisions, which provided a charge for new labor accomplishments.

The inflexible will of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people to reach set targets in domestic and foreign policy was confirmed with new strength at the 13 February Central Committee Plenum which followed the death of Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, who was unanimously elected CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized in his speech at the plenum that the party will continue to dedicate all its efforts and knowledge to the successful implementation of the plans for building communism and ensuring continuity in implementing the assignments set at the 26th CPSU Congress.

During the year, the party's Central Committee continued to direct the attention of the party members and all Soviet people to the solution of the

vital socioeconomic problems closely related to the further advancement of developed socialist society. Major documents which concretize and develop the party's economic and social strategy were drafted and approved at the April and October plenums, such as the decrees on further improving the work of the organs of socialist democracy--the soviets of people's deputies--the long-term reclamation program aimed at ensuring the stable growth of the country's food stock, and the reform of general education and professional schools.

The 15 November CPSU Central Committee Politburo meeting was of essential significance. It considered the draft state plans for the economic and social development of the USSR and the Soviet state budget for 1965. On the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the situation of the Soviet economy, in his speech, Comrade K. U. Chernenko earmarked the topical tasks of economic policy, particularly in the areas of accelerating scientific and technical progress, production intensification and increased effectiveness, and strengthening the regime of conservation of labor and material resources. After approving in its essential lines the draft plans and budget, the Politburo deemed it necessary to make the instructions and conclusions contained in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech the foundation of the activities of all party, state and economic organs, public organizations and labor collectives.

The important thoughts and concepts relative to the ways of improving developed socialist society, expressed by Comrade K. U. Chernenko in a number of speeches, including those at the All-Union Economic Conference on Problems of the Agroindustrial Complex, the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations, the anniversary plenum of the board of the USSR Writers Union and the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers, drew great attention in the country and abroad.

The All-Union Practical Science Conference on Perfecting Developed Socialism and Party Ideological Work in Light of the Resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum was of topical significance. It enabled us to check the pulse beat of ideological activities compared to social efficiency criteria and the overall labor rhythm in the country. It became an important link in preparations for the forthcoming 27th Party Congress.

During those months the party did extensive and fruitful work to provide a new impetus for the accelerated development of the national economy and the fuller utilization of its tremendous potential. Major steps were taken to intensify economic growth. The Energy and Food programs were systematically implemented. A line of comprehensive strengthening of discipline, organization and order was followed. The further development of the positive economic trends, which had become apparent the previous year, were a tangible result of these steps.

The growth rates of public production increased and its quality indicators improved. Compared to 1983, the national income increased by 3.1 percent; the volume of industrial output rose by 4.4 percent and the growth of labor productivity exceeded 4 percent, accounting for 93 percent of the increased industrial output. Positive changes occurred in agriculture. Freight and passenger transportation work improved. The opening of traffic along the

entire Baykal-Amur Mainline, this truly national construction project, which was opened 1 year ahead of schedule, was an outstanding event.

Major social programs, including housing construction, were successfully implemented. The well-being of the people improved: real per capita income increased by 3.3 percent and social consumption funds by 3.5 percent.

Alongside the solution of current national economic problems, the party took steps to ensure the formulation of long-range plans aimed at achieving in the near future a decisive upturn in the intensification of all economic sectors and the radical restructuring of the economic mechanism. The political and ideological superstructure of Soviet society continued to improve and social relations were developed further. The main emphasis in this area was put on increasing the interested participation of the working people in the administration of governmental and social affairs. In an effort to influence more efficiently the course of social processes, the party continued to improve the means and methods of social management in accordance with the requirements of the time and the new tasks.

The 4 March USSR Supreme Soviet elections, which took place ubiquitously under circumstances of high political activeness, were a major political event in the life of the Soviet people. The new membership of the Supreme Soviet Presidium was elected at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, on 11-12 April. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, was unanimously elected presidium chairman.

The CPSU, which is theoretically interpreting and summing up the tremendous amount of acquired experience, is directing its creative thoughts to the future. It proceeds from the fact that in the course of its progress our socialist fatherland has come close to the point of serious quality changes, i.e., to a higher level of social, economic and scientific and technical progress. In this respect, the intensive preparations for the 27th Party Congress, which had taken place over the past few months, were of truly historical significance. Attention was focused on formulating a new draft CPSU program based on all essential new developments which appeared in social practice and theory over the past quarter of a century, indicating the indivisibility between current and long-range projects and aiming at making all aspects of Soviet social life consistent with the highest scientific concepts of socialism. The Basic Directions for Economic Development During the 12th Five-Year Plan and Through the Year 2000 were drafted in close relation with this main theoretical and political document.

In advancing toward the congress, the Soviet people inseparably link all their achievements and plans for the future with the party's tireless activities. They give the party their firm and inflexible support. They are fully resolved selflessly to work for the implementation of its Leninist political course, which is the expression of the people's basic interests and expectations.

The life of all fraternal socialist countries was characterized by creative toil, construction and perfecting the new society. In resolving broad and

difficult problems, they confidently advanced toward ever higher stages of economic and social maturity.

The members of the socialist commonwealth have reached an important and fruitful development stage. Behind them lie decades of persistent and dedicated work and historical accomplishments, the significance of which was visibly emphasized by several anniversaries in the life of the fraternal peoples celebrated in 1984: the 40th anniversary of People's Poland, socialist Romania and the socialist revolution in Bulgaria, the 35 anniversary of the socialist German state, the GDR, and the 60th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The successes achieved by the members of the socialist commonwealth, on the economic development front in particular, were another substantial proof of the truly inexhaustible opportunities of socialism. Their national income substantially increased in 1984 and so did their industrial and agricultural output. As a whole, the growth rates of the gross national income of the 10 CEMA member countries for the past 2 years were 50 percent higher compared to the beginning of the current 5-year period.

As last year's events convincingly proved, the high road to the further economic, political and defense strengthening of the fraternal countries goes through collective efforts and the joint actions of the members of the socialist community, which lead to the overall strengthening of the global positions held by real socialism. More than ever before, priority is given to following a common coordinated line in jointly harnessing all resources at their disposal.

The summit economic conference of CEMA member countries initiated, as we know, by the 26th CPSU Congress, was the most important event during the year. The conference was held in Moscow from 12 to 14 June. It made a profound collective study of the current stage in the development of the global socialist system and global international problems. It summed up the experience in organizing the truly equal and mutually profitable cooperation among socialist countries. The participants in the conference defined the long-term trends of economic interaction among fraternal countries and codified the adoption of a single approach to the solution of forthcoming key problems of socialist construction and improvements in the contemporary international situation. In the interests of concentrating their efforts along the most important directions, it was resolved to undertake the joint formulation of a comprehensive 15-20-year scientific and technical progress program. Priority tasks of cooperation in the qualitative upsurge of machine building and the solution of the fuel-energy and raw material problems were defined. The comprehensive development of cooperation in food and consumer good production was envisaged.

The conference, which took place in a constructive and practical spirit and an atmosphere of complete reciprocal understanding, friendship and unity, marked a new stage in the development of relations among fraternal parties and CEMA member countries and a major step forward in coordinating their economic policies. The implementation of the documents adopted at the conference will unquestionably raise to a new level the economic cooperation among socialist

countries and will contribute to harnessing their internal reserves and broadening mutual ties.

The results of the Moscow economic conference were highly rated by all fraternal parties which immediately undertook their implementation. Thus, the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers approved an expanded decree which was essentially a program for action for party, soviet and economic organs in our country regarding their participation in intensifying socialist economic integration. The results of the conference were perceived elsewhere in the rest of the world as a new confirmation of the inviolable unity of the socialist commonwealth and the cohesion and inflexible resolve of the fraternal nations to follow their chosen path of building and perfecting socialism.

The regular 38th (Moscow, June) and 39th (Havana, October) CEMA sessions, held on the level of heads of governments, dealt with the implementation of the resolutions approved at the conference. The sessions proved that the strategic course formulated at the economic conference had become the practical base for the activities of fraternal parties in broadening and intensifying their reciprocal cooperation. A number of bilateral long-term programs for cooperation in science, technology and production for the period through the year 2000 have already been initialed; the formulation of a comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress for the same period has been initiated, and the coordination of the next five-year plans is under way. The activities of all CEMA bodies were directed toward the implementation of the agreements.

Guided by Lenin's view, confirmed by reality, to the effect that socialism's main influence on global developments is achieved through its economic policy and successes in the socioeconomic area, the commonwealth of socialist countries is honorably continuing to fulfill its historical mission in the contemporary world. It is playing a decisive role in the prevention of nuclear war and in creating favorable conditions for the successful national liberation struggle waged by the peoples. As it implements basically new forms of social organization, it is also contributing to the restructuring on a just basis of the entire system of international relations. It is the bulwark and hope of the struggling working class and all working people in the capitalist countries.

Unlike the confident progress made by the countries of real socialism, the promises of bourgeois politicians notwithstanding, 1984 did not bring the capitalist world major economic successes. As it were, this world was unable to lay the beginning of a stable economic upsurge after experiencing the most severe crisis of postwar decades which hit the West. The economic revival proved to be quite modest and unstable, distinguished by unevenness and instability. The industrial output of the developed capitalist countries was only slightly higher than that of the precrisis 1980. Unemployment was reduced insignificantly, to 8.5 percent of the active population, affecting more than 32 million people. The effect of the law of uneven capitalist development, which leads to the aggravation of interimperialist contradictions, was manifested clearly: U.S. and Japanese monopoly capital was able to surmount more easily many consequences of the production decline

caused by the crisis compared to Western European capitalism. The excessively high interest rates in the United States, which harm the interests of the other Western countries, were clearly detrimental to the stable revival of their economic situation. The economic indicators of the second half of the year, which indicated a new decline in the United States, confirmed the accuracy of forecasts of the "brittleness" of the economic revival.

The past year confirmed the increased breakdown in relations between governments and population masses in the capitalist countries, which was particularly tangible in Western Europe. The growing discontent of the working people was triggered by the lack of steps to fight unemployment and significant cuts in social allocations. Cases of mass civic disobedience to decisions made by parliaments and governments triggered, above all, by the population's protests against the nuclear arms race, multiplied.

However, significant social circles in the Western countries remained under the influence of the propagandist concepts of "cold war," trapped by anti-Soviet and antisocialist fabrications and noisy provocative chauvinistic campaigns. The influence of such means of indoctrination of public opinion was manifested, in particular, in the results of the U.S. 6 November presidential elections, which resulted in the victory of Reagan, who was nominated for reelection and energetically supported by the right-wing reactionary circles of American monopoly capital.

Reacting to the process of the politicizing of the people's masses, which assumed unparalleled scale, the right-wing circles in the capitalist countries hastened to apply their authoritarian antidemocratic methods for surmounting the economic crisis and pursuing the arms race. The ideology and practice of neoconservatism, which preaches the permissibility of the use of any means for the defense of the "free world," i.e., imperialism, were given priority in the struggle against the forces of progress.

The Western right-wing bourgeois governments hastily strengthened and expanded their repressive state apparatus: army, police, special services and courts. The trade union movement, already weakened by mass unemployment, felt the particularly systematic strikes of this monopoly apparatus. Efforts were made to deprive the working people of important gains, such as the right to strike, unemployment aid, etc.

Mass strikes and powerful demonstrations, which were held by the trade unions in virtually all Western countries in 1984, were the answer of the organized labor movement to the onslaught of monopoly capital. The strike of the British miners, which has lasted for more than 9 months, and which is an unparalleled clash in the history of the British trade union movement against the repressive machinery of the state, was a vivid manifestation of the militant mood of the Western European working class.

The reduced pace of economic development was tangibly felt in the daily life of the liberated countries. The difficulties triggered by their economic and social backwardness, inherited from the colonial past, were worsened by the substantially increased exploitation of these countries by international capital, American above all, which tried to shift to them an increasing share

of the burden of its economic troubles. The problem of the external indebtedness of the young countries, which substantially exceeded \$800 billion and which is continuing to grow, assumed particular gravity. The lagging of these countries behind the leading capitalist states in most important economic indicators intensified. The reliance of imperialist countries on force, the creation of spheres of "vital interests" and promoting discord is forcing many liberated countries to spend for defense funds extremely necessary for their development.

Profiting from the grave economic situation of the liberated countries launched a mass onslaught on their national sovereignty, freedom and independence. Incessant efforts were made to destabilize and undermine progressive regimes in Asian, African and Latin American countries, and to divide the nonaligned movement and the various intergovernmental associations set up by these countries.

The international working class, headed by its battle vanguard--the communist and worker parties--which assumed a firm position as systematic defenders of the basic interests of the broadest possible toiling masses, marched in the front ranks of the fighters against the omnipotence of monopoly capital in the developed capitalist and liberated countries, fighting for economic and social progress and for the actual observance of basic human rights. Through their persistent efforts and impeccable service to the people's cause, the Marxist-Leninist parties further enhanced the role of the communist movement in social development and its prestige and influence.

The communists considered as closely interrelated the two main trends of activities at the present stage in global developments: the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace and the struggle for resolving the economic and social problems triggered by the intensifying crisis of the capitalist system. The rapidly developing process of expanding the ranks of participants in this sociopolitical struggle calls for upgrading the organizing and guiding role of the fraternal parties. Under such circumstances, it becomes particularly important for each one of them to be able to defend its positions on matters of principle and systematically to pursue a clear class trend in the revolutionary struggle, combining a consideration of the specific features of the contemporary situation with loyalty to the basic stipulations of Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist revolution. As was pointed out at the Prague meeting of representatives of communist, worker and revolutionary-democratic parties to discuss the work of the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, it is particularly important under the current circumstances for the communist parties to speak out with a single voice against the threat of war and the arms race.

The overall international situation remained worrisome last year. As in the past, it was characterized by the stubborn confrontation between the two most important opposite processes. On the one hand, the arms race intensified and the threat of war increased. On the other, the influence and activeness of forces opposing the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe and, in the final account, capable of erecting reliable and insurmountable obstacles on its way and defending the peace, strengthened and increased. The confrontation and

intertwining of these most important processes were the base for the complex and largely conflicting picture of international life on the planet.

The threat of a nuclear missile slaughter hanging over mankind and the gravest threat to peace were caused by the drastic energizing of the most reactionary and aggressive imperialist forces, the U.S. ruling circles above all, who aspired to gain military-strategic superiority over the USSR and the other members of the socialist community and to establish their global domination. By mobilizing its still-substantial resources, international imperialism tried to mount a broad global counteroffensive in the hope of stopping the course of global development, seeking social revenge and stopping and hindering the liberation movement of the peoples and isolating through intransigent confrontation the countries of real socialism, harm them and discredit the Soviet Union as a great power and, as a result of all this, restore and strengthen its class positions in different countries and regions and in the world at large.

The exceptional importance and relevance of the conclusion drawn by V. I. Lenin in his report to the 9th RKP(b) Congress, in the spring of 1920, were apparent once again: "...The law was confirmed that the power of the revolution, the power of the pressure, energy, resolve and triumph of its victory also increase the power of resistance by the bourgeoisie. The more we win the more the capitalist exploiters learn how to unite and convert to more decisive offensives" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 244).

Something of the sort occurred last year as well. The "crusade" against socialism and all social progress, which the current American President Reagan proclaimed as early as the summer of 1982, became the common flag and ideological platform of international imperialism and reaction. Using the scarecrow of the "Soviet threat," and speculating on the slogan of "Western solidarity," the ruling circles across the ocean did everything possible to subordinate the interests of the other capitalist countries to their own selfish hegemonistic aspirations and to force their allies to support the American positions in international affairs and, in particular, to pay for the arms race imposed upon them by the United States. Numerous facts also proved that despite the aggravated political, trade-economic and financial interimperialist contradictions, among the United States, Western European countries and Japan in particular, Washington's main partners in the most important basic problems of world politics yielded to its pressure and remained under its thumb.

Appeals for "pax Americana," i.e., international peace American style, based on Washington's diktat and imposed with the force of arms, were sounded increasingly loudly in the United States. "Peace based on strength," the U.S. President declared, "is not a slogan but a fact of life.... Military force, whether directly or indirectly applied, remains one of the elements of American foreign policy." It became even clearer that the policy "from the position of strength" was not merely a verbal declaration by the American administration but, in practical terms, the most aggressive reactionary imperialist course tremendously dangerous to all nations on earth.

With maniacal persistence, ignoring existing realities, the hegemonists across ocean increasingly urged on armament production, hoping to disturb the existing parity on global and regional scale. It was for the sake of this acceleration of the pace that the United States pursued the implementation of long-term programs for the "comprehensive rearming of America" and of all branches of its armed forces on an unparalleled scale, above all in the area of creating and developing qualitatively new types of strategic weapons, including the highly accurate and powerful land-based MX intercontinental missiles, new ballistic missiles for Trident submarines, B-1 and Stealth bombers and cruise missiles. The deployment of American nuclear missiles--cruise and Pershing II--which are officially considered medium-range missiles but, essentially, are first-strike strategic weapons, for they can strike vital targets deep within Soviet territory, continued to be deployed in the FRG, England and Italy for the same purpose.

At the same time, the production of neutron warheads and new types of chemical weapons increased. In order somewhat to conceal its true intentions and disorient world public opinion, Washington launched fraudulent maneuvers at the Geneva disarmament conference, submitting a noisily proclaimed "new" proposal on banning chemical weapons. Actually, the proposal not only failed to contain any positive shifts in the U.S. position but actually pursued the single objective of legitimizing intelligence activities on Soviet territory under the pretext of verification.

The course charted last year by the American administration of using near space for military purposes, which would be a qualitatively new leap in the arms race, fraught with unpredictable consequences, triggered particular and growing international concern. Scorning the resolutions of the UN General Assembly and the serious warnings of peace-loving countries, many political personalities and competent scientists, the United States announced that it was initiating the implementation of a large-scale long-term program for the militarization of space as stipulated in Presidential Directive No 119 of 6 January 1984. The initial tests of antisatellite missiles were held and work was undertaken on designing and developing various types and components of space weapons.

The expatiations of official Washington to the effect that the plans for the development of a new antimissile defense system based in space are exclusively defensive are lies through and through. Such plans are the most important element of the overall militaristic program of the Pentagon and are inseparably related to the first-strike strategy. They are triggered by the illusory hope that a sudden and accurate strike from outer space could deprive the Soviet Union of its retaliatory capacity in the case of nuclear attack and make American territory less vulnerable. The Pentagon is dreaming of launching in space laser, beam or other "exotic" weapons, which will be feared by the entire world, although in the face of contemporary reality such hopes are absolutely unattainable and the militarization of near space would be as threatening to the United States as it would be to other countries.

The unwillingness to abandon the militaristic course is also confirmed by the size of the Pentagon budget for the new 1985 fiscal year, unparalleled in the history of the country: \$292.9 billion. Adding to this approximately another

\$7 billion of so-called "indirect" military expenditures, concealed in the budgets of other departments, all in all \$300 billion will be appropriated for militaristic purposes.

Along with its own intensive militaristic preparations, the United States stubbornly demanded of its allies to increase their military budgets and the further growth of NATO's conventional and nuclear potential. The American leadership heavily relied on putting together some kind of global "belt" of imperialist countries, ranging from NATO in the West to Japan in the east. Japan's "NATO-ization" is being intensified for such purposes, i.e., its involvement in the military-political plants of this aggressive bloc. The growth of Japanese militarism is being encouraged. Revanchists of all hues are becoming impudent in this atmosphere of military psychosis, inspired by Washington's example and encouraged by its calls for a "crusade." Demands to revise the territorial and political realities which developed as a result of World War II and postwar developments have increased in the FRG and Japan.

The position of the Chinese leadership which, while claiming to put distance between itself and the increased confrontation between the two courses in global politics, frequently supported in fact one Washington militaristic action or another, could not remain unnoticed in the international arena.

One more proof of the fact that the forces of reaction, in an effort to destabilize the situation in countries which have taken the path of independent and progressive development, do not shy at any crime was the assassination of Indira Gandhi, the outstanding state and public leader, on 31 October, and the subsequently provoked mass population clashes based on communal and religious controversies. However, the wave of domestic disorders was quickly brought under control with the decisive steps taken by the Indian government, and actively supported by the patriotic population strata.

The aggravation of Soviet-American relations, which perniciously influence the general international situation, triggered great concern through the world. It was the direct consequence of the course charted by Washington of intransigent confrontation with the USSR in all directions, torpedoing bilateral talks, violating concluded agreements and denouncing them. This was the result of a fierce anti-Soviet and anticommunist propaganda campaign.

Forced to take into consideration the feelings of international public opinion and the broad American strata to a certain extent, particularly in connection with the U.S. presidential elections, toward the end of 1984 the White House began to alternate its anti-Soviet rhetoric with statements that it was unavoidable for the USSR and the United States "to exist in the world side by side," and on readiness for discussions with the Soviet Union emphasizing, however, the fact that "the United States will conduct such talks from a position of strength."

Last year also brought extensive proof of the increased direct aggressiveness of American imperialist policy in various parts of the globe. With cynical frankness Washington displayed its hegemonistic great-power ambitions and brazen claims of being the strongest of all, threatening everyone and disposing of the destinies of other countries and nations. Virtually

throughout the entire globe, the seas and continents are proclaimed spheres of American "vital interests." The militant chauvinism and messianism of the American imperialists were reflected most vividly in the electoral platform of the ruling Republican Party. "America is No 1," haughtily stated this document. "America does not apologize for its foreign policy."

Washington intensively camouflaged through demagogic expatiations on the struggle for "freedom" and "democracy," its hegemonistic and reactionary course and policy "from a position of strength" and state terrorism, trying to substantiate them by citing considerations of a "moral order." Anything which the United States considers advantageous and permissible for itself, including the overthrow of legitimate governments, interference in internal affairs, violation of the sovereignty of other countries and waging undeclared wars, is considered moral. On 3 April 1984 President Reagan signed Directive No 138 which, under the pretext of fighting terrorism abroad, asserts the "principle of preventive strikes." And since Washington tries to label as "international terrorism" all anti-imperialist and national liberation movements, this means granting official status to acts of state terrorism, arbitrariness and violence toward sovereign countries, long pursued by the United States.

The undeclared war waged by American imperialism against the people's regime in Afghanistan continued. Gross U.S. intervention in Middle Eastern affairs remained uninterrupted. The Pentagon set up a show of "military muscle" in the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. Washington applied strong pressure on countries in the southern part of Africa with a view to persuading them to make substantive concessions to the Republic of South Africa. The main threat, however, was in Central America. Demagogically donning the cloak of fighter for "democracy," "freedom" and "human rights," the U.S. administration in practice pursued in this area a policy of state terrorism, above all against the people of Nicaragua. The CIA manual on terrorist activities against Nicaragua, which was published in the press, was a scandalous exposure of such policy. From sending into the territory of this independent republic Somoza gangs, trained by American instructors and armed with American weapons, and from mining Nicaraguan ports and mounting an economic blockade and political pressure, the United States turned to preparations for direct "Grenada-style" imperialist intervention.

It was thus that the actions of imperialist forces of American imperialism above all, strained the situation by preserving the old and starting new hotbeds of tension in various parts of the world and creating a serious threat to the peoples. Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized that "however much the United States may be flexing its military muscle, it will be unable to change the world. The world will not start living by American standards." These words express accurately and meaningfully the essence of an exceptionally important trend developing in the contemporary world: the growth of the stubborn and decisive resistance shown by the peoples of different countries and continents to imperialist diktat and a rebuff of efforts to interfere in their internal affairs. And if the Washington hegemonists hoped to "teach a lesson" to other nations and to gain their obedience and submissiveness by trampling Grenadan sovereignty with military boots in October 1983, the results turned out to be the exact opposite.

This growing trend was clearly manifested recently in the Middle East, where the decisive resistance of Arab patriotic forces results in major political defeats for the United States and Israel, its "strategic ally." The American marines were forced to leave Lebanese territory. The national unity government which was established in Lebanon denounced the previously imposed enslaving agreement with Israel and undertook gradually to normalize life in the country. The futility of efforts to resolve the Middle Eastern problem through separate deals and diktat was reemphasized.

The firmness and courage of the people of Nicaragua, who are defending their independence and right to a bright future, the heroism and will for freedom of the Salvadoran patriots, who have retained the military and political initiative, and the dedicated struggle waged by the working people in Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay and Argentina are a vivid manifestation of this trend in Latin America. The African countries as well are increasing their resistance to imperialist interference in their domestic affairs. The countries in the southern part of the continent, Angola and Mozambique above all, are stubbornly defending their freedom and securing reliable safety from aggressive South African actions, demanding true independence for Namibia and the abolishment of the apartheid system.

All in all, the 1984 results yielded new and irrefutable proof that the objectives pursued by imperialism, the ruling U.S. circles above all, by heating up the world situation and pursuing a policy "from a position of strength" and state terrorism, will remain unattainable. Imperialism is unable to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples and to stop social progress.

The global view of international life and the struggle waged last year clearly reflected the development of another most important process: the increased activeness and influence of forces opposing the threat of war and favoring the preservation and consolidation of peace. This positive process relies above all on the increased power and prestige of the socialist world and the active and consistent peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the entire commonwealth of socialist states.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact members countered the U.S. and NATO militaristic and aggressive course with a broad program of specific peace initiatives aimed at radically improving the international situation. This program was the fruit of the collective efforts of the fraternal countries and their coordinated foreign policy. It is a realistic and constructive foundation for reaching mutually acceptable agreements leading to limiting the arms race, strengthening security and peace and relieving mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Having formulated such a program for resolving the extremely dangerous international situation created by U.S. and NATO bloc activities, together with the fraternal Warsaw Pact members the Soviet Union acted energetically and purposefully. It took energetic practical steps and formulated new initiatives.

Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speeches and answers to appeals of various foreign public figures and organizations and questions of press organs became documents of great political significance. Each one of them contains a

profound study of the gravest problems of the international situation and the reasons for its worsening and describe the extensively clarified views held by the USSR and its peaceable foreign policy. They contain a warm appeal for decisive action aimed at restraining the warmongers and defending peace and the very right of people to life.

The proposal formulated by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the 2 March electoral meeting, "asking for all nuclear powers to agree on the joint acceptance and observance of specific norms of behavior, triggered the broadest possible international response. This proposals was dictated by a clear understanding of the current dangerous situation and the need for the countries throughout the world strictly to adhere under this situation to the existing norms of international law and rules of contacts among governments, for otherwise mankind could fall into the precipice of a nuclear catastrophe.

The new major initiative of the Soviet state met with the broadest possible response and support among nations no longer willing to live under the nuclear sword of Damocles and among all who want to safeguard peace. The reaction of the American administration and the other nuclear powers was different. They tried either to ignore and "fail to notice" the Soviet proposals or to describe them as "obsolete" and "propagandist."

The first months of the year were marked by two new impressive foreign policy actions on the part of Warsaw Pact members, addressed to the NATO countries: in January they called for removing chemical weapons from Europe; in March, for engaging in talks on keeping military expenditures at their present level and subsequently reducing them.

The value of the first initiative is that the elimination of chemical weapons from the densely populated European territory, where their use would have particularly harsh consequences, would make it possible substantially to lower the risk of chemical warfare on the continent and in the rest of the world and would mark the beginning of reducing chemical weapon arsenals and, subsequently, the total ban of such weapons and the destruction of its stockpiles on a global scale. The profound meaning of the other proposal is that reducing military expenditures would help to stop the arms race and undertake disarmament. The thus-released funds could be used for economic and social development including that of the liberated countries. In an effort to base the solution of this problem on practical grounds, the socialist states suggested the implementation of a series of urgent specific and mutually acceptable measures. However, resorting to demagogy and deliberate disinformation, the NATO countries rejected both suggestions.

The diplomacy of the fraternal countries continued its persistent many-faceted efforts to ensure the implementation of the proposal of major political significance, which was formulated as early as January 1983 by the Warsaw Pact members: the conclusion of a treaty on reciprocal nonuse of military force and maintaining peaceful relations. Such a document could substantially clear the atmosphere in Europe and contribute to the restoration of trust among the countries on the continent. The Soviet Union called for concluding a treaty on the nonuse of military force and maintaining peace with its proposals submitted to the conference on measures to strengthen trust,

security and disarmament in Europe, which opened in Stockholm in January 1984. The Soviet proposals also include large-scale measures, such as calling upon the nuclear powers to assume the obligation not to launch a first strike, to reduce military expenditures, to free Europe from chemical weapons and to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the continent. Another proposal was the formulation of additional measures of trust in developing the respective stipulations of the Helsinki Final Act. It is precisely the combination of broad political and military-technical steps which can ensure the success of the Stockholm Conference.

Once again, the position held by the United States and its NATO allies created an obstacle along this way. Their suggestions are reduced to the notorious "transparency" concept, aimed at determining the structure and activities of the armed forces of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact members or, in other words, the legalizing of NATO espionage.

As we know, for a number of years the Soviet Union has devoted extreme efforts to defeat steps to move the arms race to outer space, which are of key importance in imperialist plans, firmly opposing the development of large-scale systems of antimissile defense based in space and banning the deployment of antisatellite weapons. The Soviet 29 June initiative was another major act calling for Soviet-American talks on preventing the militarization of space. The fault for the failure to hold such talks is entirely that of the American side.

Soviet diplomacy called for discussing the banning of the militarization of space by the United Nations by raising at its 39th General Assembly Session the question "On the Use of Outer Space Exclusively for Peaceful Purposes and the Good of Mankind." Furthermore, the question "On the Inadmissibility of the Policy of State Terrorism and of Any Action by a State Aimed at Undermining the Sociopolitical System of Other Sovereign Countries" was submitted to the international forum. Both Soviet proposals met with widespread support in the United Nations.

The other fraternal socialist countries as well formulated new valuable initiatives in 1984. Thus, on the suggestion of the Mongolian People's Republic, the UN General Assembly approved by majority vote an exceptionally important document: the declaration "On the Right of the Peoples to Peace." The constructive steps taken by Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea to normalize the situation in Southeast Asia and to convert it into a zone of peace, Cuba's position in support of a peaceful just settlement of Central American problems and the suggestions of the Korean People's Democratic Republic on normalizing the situation on the Korean Peninsula met with a broad positive response.

Last year, in an effort to disorient the alarmed world public, government officials and mass information media in the United States and the other NATO countries tried to insinuate that the worsening of the international situation was not the fault of the Western countries but, allegedly, was due to the fact that the Soviet Union was refusing to hold political talks.

The CPSU and Soviet state leaders repeatedly made it clear that there was no need to "drag the USSR to talks, for it had always favored diplomatic contacts

and a political dialogue. The readiness of the Soviet Union to talk on an honest and equal footing was specifically manifested in its active and constructive positions held at the Stockholm Conference on measures to strengthen trust, security and disarmament in Europe, the initiative of engaging in talks with the United States on preventing the militarization of space, participation in the Vienna talks on limiting armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and numerous official talks with Western governmental leaders. The Soviet government repeatedly emphasized that it is ready to resolve the problem of strategic and "European" nuclear armaments in a businesslike mutually acceptable basis, through talks. Obstacles on their way were erected exclusively by the United States and the other NATO countries.

The USSR has always approached the question of bilateral relations with developed capitalist countries, including the United States, from realistic and constructive positions. The great socialist power wishes peaceful and mutually profitable cooperation with countries in all continents. "We are ready for a dialogue. We are ready actively to cooperate with governments and organizations which are willing to work for the sake of peace honestly and constructively," Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized.

As in the past, last year the Soviet Union was persistently and consistently on the side of the nations which had thrown off the yoke of colonial dependence and taken the path of independent development and nations which had to repel the attacks of aggressive imperialist forces, which created dangerous hotbeds of military conflicts and bloody violence in one part of the world or another. Talks were held in Moscow with the political leaders of Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Syria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Iraq and other countries. A friendship and cooperation treaty between our country and the Yemen Arab Republic was initialed during the visit to the Soviet Union of Yemen Arab Republic President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih. The "Proposals of the Soviet Union for a Middle Eastern Settlement," formulated in July 1984 and aimed at reaching a comprehensive settlement of the continuing conflict in this area on a just and firm basis, were received with tremendous interest and attention throughout the world.

All of this proves that the Soviet Union continues persistently and systematically to favor putting an end to and turning back the arms race, easing tension, restoring reciprocal understanding and trust among countries and turn international relations back to detente or, in a word, lift the threat of war and strengthen peace. "When it is a question of the security of the peoples, a great deal can be accomplished through foreign policy and diplomacy. However, they cannot accomplish everything," noted Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the 28 May All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations. "In the world arena we also have to deal with political forces to whom good will is alien and who are deaf to sensible reasons. Here the restraining power of our defense potential plays an irreplaceable role. Today it not only guarantees the constructive toil of the Soviet people but universal peace on earth as well."

The hopes of American and, as a whole, NATO military to disrupt the military balance and secure superiority for itself and develop additional threats to

the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact members by deploying new nuclear missiles in Western Europe failed. Under those circumstances, the Soviet Union was forced to respond with its own countermeasures. In particular, by agreement with the GDR and Czechoslovak governments, as of December 1983 it began to deploy on their territory Soviet operative-tactical longer-range missiles targeted above all on areas where the new American missiles were being deployed. Countermeasures affecting U.S. territory as well were taken. The number of Soviet missile-carrying submarines deployed along the U.S. shores was increased. In terms of their power, accuracy, accessibility of targets on U.S. territory and time of flight to the target such missiles create an additional threat to the United States equaling the one which the new American missiles in Europe bring to us and to our allies.

Understandably, should the overseas claimants to world domination continue to increase their medium-range missiles in Europe and their other nuclear forces, including the strategic ones, the Soviet Union will force to take adequate responsive measures. As the leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state have repeatedly emphasized in their speeches, we do not need military superiority. We do not intend to dictate our will to others. However, we shall not allow an upset in the existing military balance. We shall continue to be concerned with strengthening the defense capability of our country and with having adequate means to cool off the hot heads of bellicose adventurers.

Proceeding from the firm conviction of the need for the soonest possible limitation of the nuclear arms race and, something of particular importance, the prevention of the militarization of outer space, and proving its good will, the Soviet Union took the initiative and last November called for the USSR and the United States to initiate new talks on the entire range of interrelated problems of the nonmilitarization of space and reduction of strategic nuclear armaments and medium-range nuclear missiles. In order to determine the joint understanding of the subject of such talks, A. A. Gromyko, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and George Schulz, U.S. secretary of state, will meet in Geneva on 7-8 January 1985. The peoples of all countries expect that the American side will finally show a sober approach, begin to take into consideration the realities of the contemporary world and will be guided by the principles of equality and equal security. The further development of the international situation, therefore, will greatly depend on whether or not the reelected U.S. administration will truly give a specific meaning to its peace-loving declarations.

The struggle waged by the world public against the threat of nuclear catastrophe increasingly blended with the purposeful activities of the socialist countries in 1984. The reliance of the imperialist militaristic circles on the fact that the policy of faits accomplis will bring about a disorganization in the ranks of the supporters of peace and will reconcile them with the Pentagon's and NATO's plans were refuted by reality. Conversely, the movement against the threat of war became even more widespread and decisive. The unity of action among basic components on the peace front, such as the socialist countries, the communist and worker movements and the other revolutionary and democratic forces, strengthened.

The overwhelming majority of countries seriously interested in a number of foreign policy initiatives launched by the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community have been gravely concerned with the development of international events. Their active and constructive position on problems of essential importance to improving the international situation, ending the arms race, the nuclear one above all, and strengthening trust and developing cooperation among countries met with widespread support at the 39th UN General Assembly Session.

The countries following the path of independent and democratic development sharply criticized Washington's foreign policy course. The members of the nonaligned movement energetically spoke out in favor of peaceful coexistence. The neutral countries expressed their serious concern on the subject of the developing situation. More sober views have been expressed in this connection in the ranks of the Western European allies of the United States as well, manifested in the views taken by governments of NATO countries such as Greece, which opposes the Pentagon and NATO line of further aggravation of the situation in Europe; Denmark, which refuses to support the deployment of American nuclear missiles in Europe; and The Netherlands, where the coalition government was forced to postpone by 18 months its decision on deploying such missiles in the country.

The declaration of the heads of states and governments of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden of last May, with which they appealed to all nuclear powers to stop any further stockpiling of nuclear arsenals and immediately to engage in their substantial reduction, was imbued with an awareness of the responsibility for protecting the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe. In this connection, the Soviet leadership declared its unconditional support of a viewpoint identical to that of the authors of the declaration.

Changes in views on the threat of nuclear war on the part of the Socialist International and the leadership of a number of socialist and social democratic parties, who launched initiatives aimed at reducing the threat of war and weakening international tension, confirm the appearance of a responsible approach to ensuring the peaceful future of the nations. Thus, the congress of the West German Social Democratic Party, which was held in Essen, firmly expressed itself in favor of the party's adoption of antimissile and antinuclear positions. At its annual conference, the British Labor Party approved a report in which it announced its firm intention to build its national defense on a nuclear-free basis and to remove all nuclear weapons from British territory.

Insistent demands for establishing new nuclear-free and peace zones in various parts of the world, including northern Europe and the Balkans, are clear confirmations of the understanding of the need for urgent steps to deliver mankind from the threat of nuclear destruction. Last August, a conference held by 13 countries in the South Pacific spoke out in support of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean and for putting an end to nuclear tests. The first International Conference on

To the public movement for peace in capitalist countries, 1984 was a year of noteworthy consolidation of its mass, one could say its nationwide, nature. The antiwar and antimilitaristic movement broadened and deepened the range of its demands. The growing scope of daily activities and militant actions of its participants at bases where the new American missiles are deployed and the mounting of mass international campaigns confirmed its growing vital strength.

Sensing that the antiwar movement is a real threat to their militaristic plans, the ruling U.S. and other NATO circles resorted to police repressions and judicial arbitrariness directed against its active participants. Special legislative and administrative acts were passed for the purpose of scaring people, thus facilitating official actions. The practice of keeping antiwar activists under surveillance and introducing provocateurs within its ranks was applied on a broad scale. A propaganda campaign was waged against the supporters of peace, depicting them as "enemies of the state." Efforts were made to divide the ranks of antimilitaristic organizations and to pit them against each other.

Nevertheless, the organizations of the fighters for peace and the many-faceted and varied antiwar movements as a whole not only convincingly proved their viability but even strengthened their positions as an inseparable part of social life in a number of Western countries. The ideas and proposals they formulated profoundly penetrated the minds of the broad population strata and left increasingly deep marks on political life in these countries.

The threat created by the actions and plans of aggressive militaristic circles directed against the peoples of the world and against the very existence of civilization, is resulting in the growing activeness of the tremendous potential of self-preservation of mankind, manifested in increasingly firm actions by antiwar forces in favor of a positive change in the climate of international relations. The possibility of such changes, which became apparent toward the end of the year, confirmed the inexhaustively effective strength of this potential. At the same time, however, the opposition shown by the ruling circles in Washington and its allies to making real changes and their persistent efforts to pursue their old course one way or another, as was confirmed, in particular, by the results of the December conferences in NATO's headquarters in Brussels, indicate that the forthcoming stage in the global struggle on problems of war and peace will be stubborn and difficult.

The events of 1984, which proved the clear consolidation of social and political forces favoring a policy of peace and opposing the threat of nuclear catastrophe and refining and broadening the range of demands and suggestions, left for the months to come the task of ensuring the further unification of the efforts of all peace-loving countries and peoples. The joint mass movements struggling in defense of the future of mankind and their increased efficiency are aimed at taking radical steps to reduce armaments and for disarmament and improving the international situation.

The year 1984 convincingly proved that as a whole, world socialism and the forces of social progress have today adequate power and have retained the historical initiative. They have the possibility of protecting the planet from nuclear catastrophe and, in the final account, turning the development of

international events toward peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. These forces substantially increased and strengthened in the course of the struggle between the two political courses in the world arena--the socialist course of reason and peace and the imperialist course dictated by recklessness and militarism. Their unity has strengthened in the struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and the free development of man.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

ON THE HISTORY OF THE CREATION OF THE MAIN MARXIST WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 108-111

[Review by Prof V. Kulikov, doctor of economic sciences, and Prof A. Pokrytan, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Ocherki po Istorii 'Kapitala' K. Marksa" [Essays on the History of K. Marx's "Das Kapital"]. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. V. S. Vygodskiy et al., editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, IV, 379 pp]

[Text] Marx's main work, written over a century ago, remains an unsurpassed model of scientific penetration into the essence of phenomena of social and, above all, economic life. "Das Kapital" is not a museum exhibit in the least, although it is exceptionally valuable: to this day it is brilliantly performing the role of "the most terrible shell" aimed at bourgeois society. Turning to the history of the creation of "Das Kapital" is a mandatory prerequisite for the more profound mastery of the entire methodological and theoretical wealth contained in this work. It is an organic component of the creative development of Marxism under the new historical conditions of the development of capitalism and the reaching of the initial level in the stage of maturity of the first phase of the communist system and the aggravated contradiction between the two coexisting economic systems. This makes unquestionable the relevance of the collective study prepared by the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism of a number of problems related to the development of a proletarian political economy in Marx's works, directly preceding "Das Kapital," the overwhelming majority of which were included in volumes 46 to 50 of the second Russian edition of K. Marx's and F. Engels' works.

The essays included in this publication are comprehensive, covering a broad range of problems. The book opens with the article by A. I. Malysh "Practically Tested Doctrine," which is an introduction to all subsequent essays. The article describes in a compressed and concentrated yet quite well-substantiated form the revolutionary nature of the turn made by Marx in the science of society, the features of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism and the sterility of the attacks mounted by bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians on Marxist-Leninist theory. The article describes real socialism as the live embodiment of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the basic foundations of the economic system of the new society. The

author concludes with the eloquent admission made by a contemporary anticommunist: "If I were asked to name the greatest philosopher in the field of political economy I would say 'Karl Marx, unfortunately'" (p 17).

In one of the earliest preserved letters to Marx, Engels wrote: "Until our principles have been developed in several works and logically and historically derived from preceding outlooks and previous history as their necessary extension, there will be no true clarity of mind and the majority of people will wander in darkness" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 27, p 5). In this connection, we can only agree with the fact that in the history of the creation of "Das Kapital" "that aspect in Marx's theoretical activities, the main content of which was the detailed critical study of the economic views of his predecessors remains relatively unstudied" (p 18). A partial explanation of this situation is that so far by no means all economic works used by Marx, and which played an essential role in the shaping of his views, have been published in the Russian language. Furthermore, many of the economic works of Marx's immediate predecessors have not been reprinted for a long time and have become virtually inaccessible to the readers. The main thing, however, is obviously the fact that the publication and comprehensive study of a number of preparatory economic manuscripts by Marx had not been published in the USSR, including so-called excerpt notebooks, by which we mean related excerpts and summaries of some of the manuscripts.

The book under review fills this gap to a certain extent. Most interesting in this respect, in our view, are the following articles: "On the Place of Marx's Excerpt Notebooks of the First Half of the 1850s in the History of the Shaping of the Marxist Theory of Money" by L. L. Vasina; "Marx's Development and Dissemination of His Economic Theory in the 1840s-1850s" by L. R. Mis'kevich; and "Marx's Formulation of the Theory of Land Rent in the 1840s-1860s" by M. V. Ternovskiy. On the one hand, these essays substantially broaden our concepts on the sources of Marxist economic theory and the level of development of pre-Marxian economic thinking. "On the other," one of the authors justifiably points out, "a direct comparison among sources, the interpretation of which contributed, to one extent or another, to the formulation of the concepts of Marxist political economy and Marx's summations of the material he studied, provides the possibility of understanding more profoundly the nature of the transformation he made in the field of economic theory" (p 18). This approach reveals the entire ridiculousness of charges occasionally leveled by bourgeois "Marxologists," who accuse Marx of having directly borrowed a number of elements of his economic theory from his predecessors.

So far, the initial steps have been taken in the study of Marx's manuscripts which actually turned out to be rough drafts of "Das Kapital" (the 1857-1858 manuscripts being the first, the 1861-1863, the second, and the 1863-1865, the third). Debates are continuing on the correlation between the rough and the finished drafts of "Das Kapital." Among others, repeated efforts to pit some against the others are still being made. Thus, we are familiar with two extremes: on the one hand, the independent value of the methodological and theoretical concepts developed in the manuscripts are sometimes questioned; on the other, occasionally claims are made that it is precisely the manuscripts

which represent Marx's research method, whereas "Das Kapital" merely provides a developed presentation of an already studied topic.

By entering into Marx's creative laboratory and penetrating the inner logic and sequence followed by the founder of scientific communism in developing his economic theory, the authors substantially clarify the matter. The articles "The 1861-1863 Economic Manuscript--The Second Rough Draft of 'Das Kapital'," by M. Muller (GDR), "Marx's Work on 'Das Kapital' in 1863-1865" by V. S. Vygodskiy, "Marx's Development of the Structure of the First Volume of 'Das Kapital' (1857-1867)" by I. K. Antonova and "From the History of the Second Book of Marx's 'Das Kapital,'" by A. Yu. Chepurenko, show the manner in which, with every consequent draft, the architectonics of the great work was improved and the way the missing links in the dialectical ascension from the abstract to the concrete were found. The consistently observed stipulation here is that "the formulation of the structure of 'Das Kapital' was most closely related to the requirements of the study itself and proceeded from these requirements" (p 183). The opposite is just as accurate: The very first attempt made at considering the economic categories of bourgeois society in their "inner interconnections" faced problems insufficiently developed in terms of theory and meaning. This provided a direction for the studies, as a result of which, between 1861 and 1863, Marx made substantial progress in his interpretation of absolute and relative added value and created several other components of the scientific political economy of capitalism. In particular, this applies to the theory of productive and unproductive labor, the basic elements of the theories of reproduction and crises, the theory of wages and the theory of population as a political-economic concept. "As a result of these discoveries," the authors emphasize, "the definitive structure of 'Das Kapital' was finally developed. Its division into three parts--capital production process, capital turnover process and capital and profit, included in the 1857-1858 manuscripts, substantially perfected the sketch of the January 1863 plan. In addition to value and added value in their "pure" aspect, it included other concepts, above all average profits and cost of production and separate forms of added value, such as industrial profit, rental and interest, thus directly leading to the writing of Marx's main work" (p 109). At the same time, Marx considered the need for a relatively separate and integral presentation of the history of bourgeois political economy.

A somewhat similar situation, as the book proves, was also noted in Marx's work on his 1863-1865 manuscript. The problem discussed in the third book followed two basic trends: developing the theory of average profit and production cost and formulating the theory of the land rental. It was on this basis that the structure of the book was changed and improved. "In writing the manuscript for the third book in 1864-1865," one of the authors notes, "Marx was already guided by a new concept of its structure, for which reason he included a description of the problem of the shaping of market value in the course of intersectorial competition and the conversion of the market value into the cost of production as a result of intersectorial competition, partially developed in his 'Theories of Added Value'" (p 154). As a result of Marx's special study of land rental it developed as a transformed form of added profit which, in turn, enabled him to include rentals in the overall system of "Das Kapital" categories.

As work on the third book progressed, the need for materials for the second book increased. Interrupting his study of the problems included in the third book, Marx began to work on its first draft. It was precisely at that time that the three-legged structure of the second book developed, which was subsequently invariably repeated in all subsequent drafts. Bearing in mind that the manuscripts of 1861-1863 did not include a separate section of capital conversion, the substantial progress which was achieved was obvious.

Obviously, it is within the context of the study of improvements made in the overall architectonics of "Das Kapital" that we should resolve the still-discussed question of Marx's method of study of the starting point of the system. The authors do not avoid the problem. In particular, they describe the way Marx's views on the starting point of the theoretical system of capitalism was refined in the course of the conversion from one of its variants to the other. Whereas initially Marx related the starting point to the work in general, in his 1857-1858 manuscripts he reached the following conclusion: "...One must proceed not from labor but from value, from the exchange value already developed in the course of turnover dynamics" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part I, p 207). In the 1861-1863 manuscripts the importance of the "commodity" category is quite strongly emphasized. However, in the 1863-1864 manuscripts as well, the presentation of the question of commodity and money was conceived by Marx as an introduction rather than as the first separate section (see p 142).

In greater detail and with more nuances than has been done so far, the authors describe the main stages not only of the writing of "Das Kapital" as a whole but the development of its individual problems as well. This is the viewpoint from which (along with the already mentioned articles on Marx's development of the theory of money and the theory of the land rent) that Ye. A. Melik'yan wrote the essay "Marx's Development of the Theory of Money in His 1857-1858 Economic Manuscript."

Many of the essays in the book (the already mentioned article by L. R. Mis'kevich and the article "On the Problem of Marx's Formulation of a Socioeconomic Program for the Class Struggle of the Proletariat" by V. A. Smirnova) reveal the basic feature of Marxism: unity between scientific theory and revolutionary practice. These and other essays convincingly prove that Marx took his studies "to a degree of concretizing which allowed him to formulate important conclusions on the status and the struggle of the working class in bourgeois society" (p 170).

We know that Marx and Engels were greatly interested in anything happening in Russia, for which reason it was entirely proper to include in the book materials from their correspondence on the subject of the publication of "Das Kapital" in Russia (1879-1896), which was the first country in which this brilliant work was translated.

Works on Marxist studies must meet the strictest possible requirements. Any conclusion relative to Marxian texts must be repeatedly and thoroughly weighed and comprehensively derived. This particularly applies to works prepared by an authoritative scientific center, such as the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. From this viewpoint, one could hardly rate as positive the unquestionable fact

that a number of essential problems are given in the book not merely different but even directly conflicting interpretations. The latter applies to V. P. Shkredov's article "Study of the Form of Value in the First Volume of 'Das Kapital'" (which, by virtue of the fact alone that it is concentrated not on a retrospective study of the history of the development of the theory and the method but on the interpretation of their meaning, does not fit the overall tenor of the book). For example, whereas we find in this article a sharply polemical attitude toward the fact that "in both political-economic and philosophical literature the dominant view" is that the study of the form of value in "Das Kapital" reflects not only bourgeois but also prebourgeois history of commodity and money (see p 250), qualifying this view as "abstract and false" historicism (see p 305), the article by V. S. Vygodskiy on the 1863-1865 manuscripts emphasizes something entirely different: "The logical transition from the consideration of a commodity as a prerequisite for the appearance of capital to its consideration as the product of the latter is consistent with the historical transition from precapitalist to capitalist commodity output" (p 144).

The topic of the first part of the first volume of "Das Kapital" is also interpreted differently in said articles. In the first, the author supports the thesis to the effect that the commodity, as analyzed in this section, shows a "similarity" with the precapitalist commodity not in terms of objective content but merely...by virtue of its name and external forms of manifestation. Logically, this rejection of any objective internal unity between prebourgeois and bourgeois society commodity, total rejection of the concept of the existence of a real continuity and identity between commodity relations in the historical transition from their precapitalist to their capitalist form leads to the conclusion that "consequently, whereas the system applied in "Das Kapital" includes categories known to other historical epochs as well, this does not automatically mean that this type of category also reflects relations existing during previous times" (p 301).

The conclusion drawn in the second article is essentially different: "Consequently, in the first part of the first volume of 'Das Kapital,' relations between capitalist commodity production are analyzed in their abstract form; at the same time, a study is provided here of real precapitalist commodity relations" (p 145).

Equally major differences may be found in the interpretation of the essence of Marx's understanding of the nature and origin of money. Thus, in the article on the form of value, the author claims that "there is absolutely no need...to analyze the process of commodity output" (p 255) for the genetic derivation of the exchange value and money from the study of commodity value. Furthermore, "it is impossible to define the form of value if we turn immediately from the study of the commodity and the definition of value to the study of the commodity production process," the author emphasizes (p 254). Consequently, the "positive nature" of the substance of value--abstract labor--is interpreted as objectively defined not by the contradiction between private and public labor, which is the very essence of the production process (not the basic contradiction in commodity production), but exclusively through the form of value and exchange (see pp 270-274). Naturally, the author does not consider the essence of the familiar accusation which Marx addressed to

classical bourgeois political economy that the latter "has never been able to derive the form of value from the study of a commodity and, in particular, commodity value" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 91) in the least as in the fact that Adam Smith and Ricardo were unable to determine the nature of the constructive value of labor as being not simply physiological but as expressing the concealed social nature of the functioning of immediate private producers. According to the author of the essay, the entire matter is that "classical bourgeois political economy did not see in the monetary form any essential meaningful aspect in determining value and the labor which forms it" (p 299).

This concept in the book under review is directly opposite to the following conclusion drawn by Ye. A. Melik'yan based on the study of the 1857-1858 manuscripts: "Marx proved in the 1857-1858 manuscripts that abstract labor--the substance of value--operates as a form of movement of contradictions between the public and private nature of labor. Neither Smith nor Ricardo or Proudhon were able to understand this, for which reason they were unable to derive the concept of money as a form adequately expressing the specifically public nature of labor under the conditions of commodity production" (p 17).

We would like to point out the desirability of having an identical interpretation of basic problems of Marxian economic theory in the collective works compiled by a prestigious body.

As a whole, the scientific work under review is a basic study which substantially improves our understanding of the history of the creation of Marxist political economy and which contributes to the fuller mastery of the classical heritage. The study made in the book proves convincingly, yet once again, that Marxism neither could nor did appear "ready-made," and that any view that Marxism is something frozen, something given once and for all, is profoundly erroneous. We believe that "Ocherki" will be of good service to the dissemination of Marxism and its further creative development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/6

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF THE WORLD HISTORICAL PROCESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 111-115

[Review of the book "Vsemirnaya Istoriya" [History of the World], vols I-XIII. Moscow, 1955-1983]

[Text] Very little time remains until the beginning of the 21st century and the new millennium in human history. Naturally, to a certain extent this is an arbitrary line. Nevertheless, throughout the world the people cannot fail to ask themselves what will the fate of the next century be? A variety of forecasts and assumptions are being formulated on long-range and immediate prospects of the development of science and technology, the ability of the present and future generations to govern economic and social relations and to resolve global energy, ecological and demographic problems, the type of foundation on which international relations will be built and, above all, the possibility of safeguarding peace and saving mankind from thermonuclear catastrophe.

We live in an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. The forces of social progress, which are determining the historical future of mankind, are growing and strengthening. The general crisis of the capitalist system is intensifying, although it retains certain reserves with which to prolong its century. The countries which have gained political independence are energizing their struggle for eliminating the consequences of colonialism and are seeking efficient means of surmounting their economic backwardness. The scientific and technical revolution has increased the need to remove obstacles on the way of the development of production forces. The ideological struggle has reached unparalleled gravity.

The meaning and motive forces of history have become clear to many people following the discovery by the founders of scientific communism of the laws governing social development and the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. However, this has made the ideologues of the old disappearing world mount even fiercer and more violent attacks against the materialistic understanding of history. Along with leaders, who to a certain extent tend to take into consideration the new realities which have developed on earth, their have been and will be individuals who, for the sake of safeguarding and rescuing the interests of oligarchic groups, are willing to risk the very

existence of mankind. The working people, the fighters for the establishment of a new, communist, civilization on earth, realize that the bourgeois system will continue for a long time to come to resist stubbornly and that its final elimination and the establishment of a society of social justice on earth will demand tremendous efforts on the part of the people's masses. Learning the lessons of history is of great importance in ensuring success in this gigantic struggle.

All of us are familiar with the truth that in order to have a clear view of the future one must be profoundly familiar with the past and trace the appearance and the development of contemporary social phenomena. Therefore, when discussing the future of mankind we should mentally review its entire history. This is no easy matter.

For quite some time historians have tried to provide a more or less complete picture of society, invariably setting in the center of events their own country and, most frequently, its alternating rulers. Two age-old trends have crystallized in understanding and interpreting universal historical experience. The first generally rejects any meaning in history, considering it merely as the continuing change of generations living in accordance with immutable laws or simply as dictated by hazard. This trend is characteristic of the ideologues of the doomed class, who either deny the forward march of history at all or else acknowledge it only within unrelated civilizations.

The other trend presumes the existence of dynamics in human history. In this case, however, the question of its direction is resolved differently. To this day the legend of the "golden age," lost by the people, who are increasingly sinking into vice, lives in bourgeois, clerical above all, literature.

At the same time, both in the past and, considerably more in the present, the idea of ascending historical development, of historical progress, is assuming its position in historiography. The Hegelian philosophy of history, imbued with idealistic dialectics, was the highest achievement of bourgeois historical thinking. However, neither before nor after Hegel has bourgeois historiography been able to interpret the mechanism of the historical development of humankind.

The possibility of interpreting history not only in terms of individual ages and peoples but of all humankind appeared only with the great turn which was made in science by K. Marx and F. Engels and the development and increased assertion of the historical-materialistic method of study of past and present social phenomena. Armed with this method, Marxist historians wrote hundreds and thousands of works on the basic problems of the history of human society, from primitive antiquity to the present. Soviet scientists have made an extremely great contribution to their development. This resulted in laying a foundation for the summation of the entire assimilated material, strengthened by the achievements of the science of history in all areas.

The idea of the writing and publication of a "History of the World" appeared in our country as early as the 1930s. At that time, however, this could not be accomplished. It was only 10 years after the end of the Great Patriotic War that the concept began to be implemented. Work on "History of the World"

was headed by the great scientist and outstanding organizer of scientific research Academician Ye. M. Zhukov and, after his death, the noted Soviet scientist Academician S. L. Tikhvinskiy. Top specialists in all sectors of historical knowledge were recruited. The institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences Department of History worked on "History of the World" The leading one was the USSR Academy of Sciences History Institute and, since 1968, the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Universal History.

"History of the World" was a basically a new, an original study radically different from the "world histories" created by bourgeois historiography. It was a truly scientific publication in which the Marxist-Leninist concept of the universal historical process was presented as completely as possible with the use of abundant factual data, interpreted in numerous studies by Soviet and foreign historians. Each volume of this collective work included the best achievements of contemporary domestic and world science.

The view on history through the lens of the theory of socioeconomic systems enabled us to identify the universal nature of the world historical process covering all human society without exception. The preservation of the history of mankind in the entire variety of cause-and-effect relations brings to the reader the idea of the universality of the historical process in which the history of the individual nations and countries are not accidental events.

The very first volume provides a solution to most serious theoretical problems related to the appearance of human society, classes and states. The study of this part of universal history required the joint efforts of scientists in various fields--historians, ethnographers, archaeologists and anthropologists. This was a brilliant example of creative cooperation, in the course of which they created a picture of the development of mankind covering a period in history most inaccessible and difficult to study.

From the first to the last volume, the work under review clearly answers the question of the direction of the historical process which, through a chain of system changes, opened to mankind today the way to building socialism and creating a communist society. However, the authors by no means claim that the process of ascension of the nations along the rungs of historical progress has been automatic. On the contrary, they prove that this progress was uneven everywhere and that this unevenness is based on objective and subjective reasons.

As human society developed and as corresponding changes occurred in the human habitat, in which artificial man-made elements assumed an increasingly important place, the importance of dominant socioeconomic factors increased. At the same time, physical-geographic conditions, cultural-religious traditions and the nature of relations with neighbors left a deep mark on the fate of individual countries and peoples. With the establishment of a capitalist system in a number of countries and the founding of the colonial system the uneven development of different countries and regions intensified: the bourgeois countries not only did not attempt to close the thus-formed gap but, conversely, tried to preserve the lagging of nations they exploited mercilessly. At the same time, regardless of the objectives and wishes of the colonizers, the clash between the two systems contributed to the erosion of

the other forms of social relations and to the establishment of a new production method. The possibility arose of the growth of the liberation struggle into a struggle against all forms of exploitation.

The law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism under imperialist conditions, discovered by V. I. Lenin, and his scientific conclusion of time disparities in revolutions within the capitalist world, as well as the possibility of the victory of the proletarian revolution initially in a single individual country, became the methodological foundation for the interpretation of the history of capitalism in its highest and final stage.

The materials of this multiple-volume work provides an idea of the speed of development of the historical process and the shortened existence of socioeconomic systems and transitional ages. They describe the mechanisms governing the change of systems: the material prerequisites of formative changes are brought to light and, above all, the key role which social revolutions play as boosters of historical progress is identified.

The authors ascribe a prime role to interpreting the activities of the people's masses and popular movements, not only as manifestations of discontent and opposition to exploitation but also as forces of increasing influence on the entire course of history, administrative and legal institutions and domestic and foreign policies of the ruling classes. The intensified study of the laws and ways of development of the worker and peasant movements enabled the authors to reinterpret political history and to identify changes in the power mechanism of the ruling classes at different stages in the history of capitalist countries in modern and most modern times, as well as to define the class nature of bourgeois political parties, regardless of their labels and programs behind which they hide themselves and to determine the true meaning of the bourgeois interpretation of concepts, such as "democracy," "freedom" and "equality," which gradually turned from slogans of the struggle against feudalism into the ideological substantiation and interpretation of the capitalist exploitation system.

"History of the World" systematically develops the topic of the correlation between objective and subjective factors in the global historical process. While remaining entirely and fully on monistic positions, Soviet historians have also entirely distanced themselves from any kind of teleological prejudices which exclude conscious and purposeful human activities. "The people are the makers of history." This widely familiar formula has been confirmed in this work. Nevertheless, the work does not present history as impersonal. Each epoch brought to the proscenium people who were able to understand the demands of their time, to organize large masses and to channel their activities in the interest of one social group or class or another.

The clash between the forces of reaction and progress is not abstract-schematic. It is always related to living people, personified in those who head these forces and who leave their mark on the events of their age. The role of individuals is manifested most strikingly and impressively in times of war and revolution, as convincingly proved in "History of the World."

This fundamental work by Soviet scientists pays great attention to the history of the USSR. It describes the contribution which the peoples of our country made to the development of global civilization. At the same time, however, the authors cannot be accused of any national exclusivity or admiration of the past. Remaining on systematically class-oriented positions, they depict the past of our state in terms of clashes between progressive and reactionary sociopolitical forces, the results of which were by no means simple. The Great October Socialist Revolution definitively summed up the results of this confrontation. It not only freed from exploitation the working people in the former Russian empire but also inaugurated a new chapter in the history of all mankind. The study of the appearance and establishment of the new socioeconomic system gave the authors the opportunity to bring to the foreground the study of the history of the Soviet people as the bearer of the most progressive social relations.

Let us note the high professional standard of the interpretation of problems of the history of culture, ideology and religion, particularly in the initial volumes. These exceptionally important problems which affect literally all countries and areas are interpreted in their permanent dynamic state and in close relation with changes in socioeconomic living conditions. The authors describe the contributions of the individual nations to the development of local civilizations and to the common treasury of world culture.

Of course "History of the World" is accurately named, for it covers essentially the history of all nations and all times. Its concepts are directly opposed to the Eurocentric, nationalistic and racist distortions of history as well as to reformist historiography. Particular mention should be made of the study of the anticolonial struggle waged by the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa, usually ignored or extremely misrepresented by bourgeois historiography, as well as the laws governing the development of liberation movements in different periods of world history.

The historical data in the work are presented chronologically. The synchronizing of local and regional histories also underscores the asynchronic nature of the historical process itself and the unevenness in the development of individual countries and nations. Unlike most "world histories" written in the West, in which each separate volume is a conglomerate of national histories mechanically linked on the basis of geographic or racial-linguistic characteristics, "History of the World," which was written by a large group of Soviet historians, considers such characteristics only secondary, giving priority to indicators of socioeconomic development and the affiliation of one society or another with a given system. The periodical breakdown of the global historical process and the solution of the problem of architectonics of the entire "World History" in accordance with the theory of development of socioeconomic systems do not lead in the least to the dogmatizing or deadening of the science of history, which is a charge leveled against Marxist historians by bourgeois historiography. On the contrary, this approach opens new ways to the solution of complex theoretical problems related to defining the individual stages in the historical development of mankind and the boundaries of historical ages.

A number of past events are of exceptional interest today. They include World War II, which is discussed in a separate volume. The lessons of the war are particularly relevant today, when the aggressive adventuristic imperialist circles are urging on the world to the precipice of thermonuclear catastrophe with cynical and thoughtless persistence. More than ever before, it is relevant to remember today the nature of the forces which unleashed the last world war, their objectives and the methods they used to attain them. It is equally pertinent to recall the price which mankind had to pay for the victory over fascism, and those who made the decisive contribution to the latter's defeat.

With equal justification the authors discuss in a separate volume the events of the second half of the 1940s, during which the foundations of the postwar structure of the world were laid and the people's democratic and socialist revolutions took place in several European and Asian countries and the world socialist system was founded, a period when the peoples of colonial and dependent countries achieved their national independence, while the positions of world capitalism weakened drastically as a whole.

The final 12th and 13th volumes deal with the 1950s and 1960s. However, the important socioeconomic and ideological-political processes which were initiated at that time had not ended. That is why the description of many historical events which have been witnessed by our generation are limited to scientific comments. The final volumes pay greater attention to the acceleration and increased complexity of global developments, in which internationalization processes have increased sharply. Therefore, in addition to chapters and sections dealing with the histories of individual countries and regions, the world communist and worker movements, international relations and the struggle for peace have been analyzed separately.

This basic work has the unique feature of being equally aimed at specialists and general readers. To professional historians, this is like a tuning fork which helps to tune the research apparatus used in the study of specific scientific problems and to define its position among a number of other problems which, in the final account, encompass the entire development of human society from profound antiquity to the present. To anyone else, this is a huge historical compilation in which everyone can find answers to a number of questions on the way people lived in the past, what they fought for and what their aspirations were. The clarity of presentation, rich style, accuracy and meaningfulness of formulations make this work accessible to anyone interested in the history of humankind.

"History of the World" is very popular in our country and abroad. Its volumes are constantly in use in thousands of libraries and are constantly requested by secondary and higher school students, teachers, propagandists, scientific workers and a tremendous number of lovers of history. Its first volumes have become a bibliographic rarity. "History of the World" has been fully or partially translated and published in many socialist and capitalist countries.

Almost 30 years separate us from the publication of the first volume. During that time the science of history has made great progress. Successes in anthropology and archaeology have pushed back by thousands of years the

appearance of man himself. Data on previously unknown ancient civilizations have been obtained. The study of the history of Africa and many other areas on earth reached a qualitatively new level within this period. Substantial refinements and additions could be made today to all volumes of "History of the World." A critical view of this publication will reveal that not all parts are equally convincing and that the authors have not been able to include in postwar history the various types of culture and rapidly developing science, the role of which is increasing with every passing day, and that the historical-ecological and historical-demographic topics, the significance of which is becoming increasingly obvious, are barely noted. Insufficient attention has been paid to global problems which have come to the foreground of global developments.

Nor have the authors been able entirely to surmount the traditional tendency of considering universal history as the sum of the histories of individual nations. The assessment of a number of events and processes requires refinements consistent with the results of the latest research. Nor can we agree with the fact that the interpretation of universal history stopped with the 1960s. Understandably, an economic study on such a scale cannot be turned into a chronograph scrupulously recording historical facts in their temporal sequence; nor could it become an instant analysis of the political situation in the world, subject to a variety of circumstantial fluctuations. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind that the study of the subsequent decades in the development of the world is of particular interest to the readers and is of tremendous scientific, political and ideological importance. It is a task not only of publicists and individual researchers but of academic science as a whole. We believe that in all respects--for the sake of the most profound and purposeful interpretation of the distant past, in accordance with the results of the latest studies, and the study of processes of recent decades--work on "History of the World" should go on.

Nevertheless, such shortcomings are incommensurate with the tremendously useful contribution of this definitive work to science. It will remain useful for a long time to come and the time will come when the Soviet scientists will write a new "History of the World." However, this one will forever remain in domestic and world historiography as an outstanding achievement of Soviet historical thinking in the second half of the 20th century.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS AND UNIVERSAL SECURITY IN THE NUCLEAR CENTURY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 115-119

[Review by Dr of Historical Sciences V. Petrovskiy of the following books: (1) "Mezhdunarodnyye Konflikty Sovremennosti" [Contemporary International Conflicts]. V. I. Gantman responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 407 pp; (2) "Atlanticheskiye Soyuzniki: Novyye Tendentsii v Sopernichestve" [The Atlantic Allies: New Rivalry Trends] by G. A. Vorontsov and A. I. Utkin. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1983, 240 pp; (3) "Mezhdunarodnaya Bezopasnost' i Global'nyye Problemy" [International Security and Global Problems] by Yu. Ye. Fedorov. D. G. Tomashevskiy, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 176 pp]

[Text] The world situation drastically worsened at the start of the 1980s by the fault of the aggressive imperialist U.S. circles and as a result of the adventuristic military-power trend of their global policies. This endangered international security. Under these circumstances, the accurate course followed by our Leninist party and Soviet state of ensuring lasting peace on earth, preventing the threat of war, and unalterable readiness to develop a constructive foreign policy line today as well, in the century of nuclear weapons and superaccurate missiles, have become even more important.

"As a great socialist power," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out, "the Soviet Union is fully aware of its responsibility to the peoples for the preservation and consolidation of peace. We are open to mutually profitable cooperation with countries on all continents. We favor a peaceful solution of all international disputes through serious, equal and constructive talks. The USSR will fully interact with all countries willing, through their practical efforts, to help reduce international tension and create an atmosphere of trust in the world or, in other words, with those who will truly work not for preparations for war but for strengthening the foundations of peace."

This policy pursued by the USSR is entirely consistent with the expectations of mankind. The peace-loving forces which support it are energizing their efforts in the struggle for strengthening international security precisely because today it means, above all, safety from nuclear war. Actually, since it is closely related to limiting armaments and to disarmament, nuclear

disarmament above all, international security is related to the need to prevent the outbreak of grave international conflicts or, should this happen, to promote their peaceful and just settlement through political means. Such conflicts, which break out in different parts of the world, are of an either rapidly developing or protracted and strictly "local" nature, or else they spread rapidly, frequently reaching extremely tense stages in crises and the armed struggle and the potential of growing into a conflict involving the great powers and global nuclear confrontation. That is why strengthening international security presumes effective counteraction to the militaristic policy not only of the present administration in Washington but of NATO powers, who are making possible the administration's actions such as, for example, the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe, aimed at changing the ratio of forces in favor of the United States and the entire Atlantic bloc.

Such crucial problems of international relations of the 1980s have been subjected to a serious scientific study in several new research works by Soviet experts in international affairs.

The definitive theoretical work (1), prepared by a group of scientific associates of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations, is of unquestionable interest. This is also a work of the Scientific Council on the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament and reflects one of the most important trends in its activities. Unquestionably, in terms of scale, depth and systematic presentation of the material, this is a most significant attempt in our literature to analyze international conflicts and their role in contemporary world politics and the possible ways of their prevention and resolution in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory and methodology. The summations contained in the book are based on actual data of international conflicts which broke out in the 1970s and 1980s, emphasizing practical aspects. This makes them very useful in exposing the imperialist misrepresentations of the origin, nature and significance of present-day international conflicts.

The chapter dealing with the theoretical and methodological problems of the study of international conflicts sets the tone and defines the problems discussed in the rest of the work. It emphasizes that "V. I. Lenin not only laid the theoretical and methodological foundations for the dialectical-materialistic study of international conflicts but also set the brief yet amazingly meaningful example of how to study and forecast the basic contradictions, nature, essence and content, systems, structures and processes governing the development of specific conflicts" (p 19).

The authors have clearly defined their own research topic, on which the book's structure and content are based. They consider international conflicts "as a particular political relationship between two or several peoples, states or groups of states, which reproduce on a concentrated basis, directly or indirectly, clashes of interests, objectives and practical objective and subjective sides on which such relations are based--economic, socioclass, political, ideological, territorial, national (tribal) religious or other contradictions of different nature and type and corresponding relations" (p 16).

Therefore, the study of the class nature of the international conflict and the contradictions which triggered and were manifested within it become the initial postulates in the elaboration of a scientific classification of contemporary international conflicts. In turn, it is clear that such classification alone will enable us to understand the specific features of present-day international conflicts.

The authors rightfully claim that the basic criteria applied by Lenin in developing a scientific classification of wars under imperialism offer the key to the "elaboration of a broader classification of international conflicts in our time" (p 37). They emphasize that by following Leninist methodology the classification of international conflicts is structured on the basis of the main class contradiction of the epoch. Such classification includes other contradictions typical of the age, which trigger international conflicts, and identifies their vital interrelationship with the basic contradiction.

The first chapter of the monograph provides a theoretical schemata of all conceivable international conflicts of our time, consisting of three basic types: I) international conflicts directly reflecting the contradictions and struggle between the two socioeconomic systems in the international arena; II) international conflicts triggered by contradictions between imperialism and the national liberation movement and imperialism's efforts to resolve such contradictions in its favor, to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples and to encourage and use for its own purposes internal and intergovernmental contradictions among developing nations; III) international conflicts, which reflect interimperialist contradictions and struggle. Each of these basic types of conflicts includes basic subtypes--19 are listed (see pp 40-41). The authors note that this suggested classification does not, naturally, claim to be complete, although it obviously sums up the majority of possible types of variants of different conflict situations. In this connection, they emphasize with full justification that the main typological laws can be identified only if compared against reality and that we must always consider the variety of individual features of each conflict. Chapter 5, which deals especially with the foreign policies of the United States, Great Britain, France, the FRG, Japan, Italy and other capitalist countries, their military groupings and political associations, and the foreign policy of the liberated countries in connection with specific international conflicts of our time, is an example of such a specific analysis. This enables us to identify not only the common features inherent in imperialist policy as a whole but also the characteristics of the specific positions held by one Western country or another in international conflicts.

The book (2) deals with this topical subject. It is self-evident that in present-day circumstances it is important to know how distant from integrity and unity is the contemporary capitalist world and the acute contradictions which divide the Atlantic partners--the United States and Western Europe (according to the classification we cited, this is one of the subtypes of the third type of basic conflict: a conflict resulting from economic and military-political contradictions among major imperialist countries).

The merit of this book lies in that it discusses new problems of inter-Atlantic relations, which became clearly apparent in the first half of the 1980s, but remain understudied in Soviet literature: differences in the approach to detente, competition in arms sales and nuclear power industry, and differences on the new international economic order. In addition to the various aspects of intra-Atlantic relations, the authors sum up the experience of Western summit meetings and analyze in detail the activities of the influential ideological and political centers such as the Trilateral Commission. An accurate picture is painted of the struggle within Atlantic circles and of the search for a solution to interimperialist conflicts which break out within NATO.

As it pursues its course of increasing international tension, the present administration in Washington is paying greater attention to its rivals in Western Europe, where the overall political situation is objectively more favorable to strengthening the trends helping international security, the preservation of detente and improving business relations with the members of the socialist community. This makes the chapter on differences in the views held by the United States and Western Europe on problems of detente and, essentially, of international security, particularly interesting to the reader, who would like to obtain a detailed and substantiated picture of the political situation in the West in connection with the aggravation of the international situation. Also innovative is the chapter on the struggle among imperialist rivals on the armament market. Noteworthy here is a depiction of the methods of sharp rivalry among Western countries, both within NATO and in the liberated countries. The authors also discuss traditional Atlantic contradictions in the economic and monetary areas. In my opinion, equally well-substantiated is the largely new interpretation of basic trends in the development of the competitive struggle between the two areas, particularly in the monetary sphere, especially in the process of the creation and functioning of the European monetary system. As a whole, we can say that this work is a contribution to the study of contemporary relations between the United States and Western Europe, considered from the viewpoint of international security.

World events of the last 10-15 years increasingly confirm the fact that international security and global problems, such as energy, raw materials, food, ecology or the underdevelopment of many Asian, African and Latin American countries, are closely interrelated (subtype of type II of basic conflicts: conflicts resulting from the implementation of expansionistic plans of capitalist states toward developing countries). The work (3) is a study of these complex and not always simple relations. This work was also prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations and was published under the aegis of the Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament.

The author uses specific data to prove that easing the gravity of said problems and eliminating their most dangerous consequences on a global scale require the strengthening of international security and, above all, restricting the arms race and developing extensive, equal and mutually profitable international cooperation. "Military activities," the author writes, "in all their manifestations, starting with the arms race and ending

with military operations, are an important and sometimes truly decisive factor in the aggravation of such problems" (p 7).

The author further states that "the global problems of economic development, which pile up atop contradictions of socioclass and political nature, could contribute to their growth into international conflicts and crises. Refracted through the policies of reactionary forces, they act as a source of threat to international security" (pp 56-57). Indeed, the aggravation of the energy and raw material problems during the 1970s, passing through the mechanism of the shaping and implementation of U.S. foreign policy, and reflected in the political thinking of the leadership in that country, led to the appearance of the concept of "war for resources" and contributed to the drastic intensification of interventionist activities by Washington in the zone of the liberated countries. The author cites many other examples which expose the militaristic reaction of some ruling circles of state-monopoly capital to global economic problems.

The foreign policy reaction of the USSR and the other members of the socialist community to the appearance of such problems is of an essentially different and systematically peaceful nature. This is based on the very nature of the socialist state, whose foreign policy reflects the basic interests of mankind and is related to lifting the threat of nuclear catastrophe, meeting needs for energy, raw materials and food, and eliminating the underdevelopment of vast areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The appearance of global problems has given international security some additional new dimensions, for such problems exceed the national framework. The serious scientific study we find in (3) is one more proof of the fact that the solution of global economic problems may be ensured only by strengthening international security.

As we may see, the materials in (2) and (3) confirm the usefulness of the classification of international conflicts of our time as developed in the collective monograph. It rejects the far-fetched approaches of bourgeois political science (that of H. Kahn above all) to the study of the dynamics of conflicts and the efforts to squeeze them within preprogrammed and fatally predetermined schemata, including a "thermonuclear spasm." The authors point out that after crossing a number of phases a conflict could also reach a most grave political level such as an international political crisis, and develop into an international armed conflict. However, in defining some general criteria of the transition from one phase to another, they also emphasize the possibility of a "nonstandard" development of a conflict, the appearance of individual "unforeseeable" phases in its development and, under certain circumstances, a "reverse" development of the conflict, from armed struggle to political forms of confrontation. We believe that this study of the phases of development of an international conflict, an international political crisis or armed struggle is of great theoretical and practical value.

In considering, as Lenin taught, contemporary international conflicts in the context of global developments and profound economic, social, political, ideological and other contradictions, the authors legitimately concentrate their attention on problems of the interaction between the global

revolutionary process and international conflicts, exposing fabrications of an anticommunist and anti-Soviet nature on this subject.

Unquestionably, one way or another the basic international conflicts of our time are related to the confrontation between imperialism and revolutionary forces. This became particularly clear by the turn of the 1980s. However, as the question is properly formulated in the book, in this case their source is not the global revolutionary process per se but the efforts of imperialism to "stop" revolutionary progress along a broad front--in the struggle against socialism, the national liberation movement and the communist, worker and democratic movements in the capitalist countries. It is for this sake that imperialism is trying to promote many international conflicts and, in frequent cases, directly to interfere in them with naked military force.

The authors substantiatedly refute bourgeois, reformist and revisionist concepts to the effect that the forces of socialism and revolution are responsible for international conflicts and wars. In reality, neither socialism nor revolutionary movements today need such conflicts or wars. The transformation of socialism into a powerful international force has made it possible not only to counter the conflict-oriented imperialist policy but to limit it effectively as well. In proving this, the authors emphasize that under certain circumstances it is precisely the influence of the course and outcome of the revolutionary struggle which could put an end to international conflict. However, in the light of the practical experience of recent decades, their thesis to the effect that always and under all circumstances clashes with imperialism could be avoided, when it interferes politically, ideologically and, frequently, with military force in the development of revolutionary processes, is hardly substantiated.

Chapter 3 of the monograph discusses the characteristics of recent international conflicts, including those which broke out during the period of detente. In addition to the study of the role, nature and limits of utilization of military power, characteristic of many conflicts of the 1970s-1980s, it offers a profound study of nonmilitary "power factors," used by imperialism in international conflicts, insufficiently covered by our scientific publications yet actually quite important. Nor can we ignore the foreign policy practices of the United States which, of late, has extensively resorted in its imperial ambitions to the artificial "linkage" of conflict situations which are totally unrelated. Unquestionably, this increases the threat of development of an entire chain or "cluster" of international conflicts, which imperialism is trying to manipulate. The monograph's study of the objective and "assimilated" U.S. interaction with international conflicts throughout the world in the 1970s and 1980s appears quite convincing.

In our view, the publication of (1) is quite timely, particularly in the light of the difficult international situation of the 1980s and the aggravation of the struggle against aggressive imperialist aspirations. The close combination between the theoretical and historical approaches make it a major scientific contribution.

The book convinces us of the fact that the realities of the contemporary world may be consistent only with a policy based on the fact that the national security of some countries cannot be strengthened at the expense of harming the national security of others; that the breakdown of the existing military-strategic parity between the socialist and the capitalist world is impossible and that relying on such a breakdown threatens everyone; and that the "balance of fear" should be replaced by a balance of mutual trust based on the strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security and a countermovement toward reducing the level of military confrontation.

The imperialist policy of the arms race, the ceaseless heating up of tension and the outbreak of armed conflicts in various parts of the world, which threaten universal peace and the security of nations, are countered by the Soviet Union with a consistent policy of strengthening peace, preventing nuclear war and eliminating explosive hotbeds of tension. "We are deeply convinced," Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized in his answer to questions asked by the newspaper PRAVDA, "that conflict situations can and must be settled through peaceful means only, taking fully into consideration the interests of those who are directly affected and guided by the broad objectives of strengthening international security."

The profound study of the problems of international conflicts and universal security in the nuclear century is by no means academic. It is important in the further development by Soviet scientists of the theory of international relations, which must actively contribute to the implementation of the Leninist strategy of peace, supported by our party and state. This is the value of the books under review.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

SHORT BOOK REVIEW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 119-120

[Text] A. Gramsci. "Formirovaniye Cheloveka (Zapiski o Pedagogike)" The Shaping of Man (Notes on Education)]. Pedagogika, Moscow, 1983, 224 pp. Reviewed by A. Golubev.

This is a book of articles, letters and notes by Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), the noted leader of the Italian and international communist movement, founder and leader of the Italian Communist Party and Marxist theoretician, dealing with problems of the education and upbringing of working people, young people and children.

For the first time in Soviet literature, A. Gramsci's views on education are presented in a concentrated fashion. The scope of his ideas is exceptionally broad. In works covering the period from his university years to his detention in 1926, he speaks of the importance of educational activities in the class struggle of the proletariat, formulates the requirements of the Marxist party in the area of public education, exposes the reactionary nature of bourgeois school policy and emphasizes the importance of mastering the positive experience of the young Soviet school.

During his internment, which lasted more than 10 years, Gramsci continued persistently to work. The outcome of his efforts was his "Prison Notebooks," which contain profound thoughts on a very broad range of sociopolitical and cultural problems. His pedagogical interests were focused on the Marxist doctrine of man and the conditions governing his molding and development. The book under review convincingly proves the author's loyalty to the ideals of scientific communism, his profound scientific understanding of the nature of the personality and drastic rejection of religious concepts of man. Noteworthy to this day is his criticism of Roman Catholicism and his assessment of religion as "the most gigantic utopia," for it is an "attempt to reconcile in a mythological form real contradictions of historical life" (p 67).

Gramsci's letters to friends and relatives account for a considerable share of the collection. Here again we find a rich educational content. One cannot read without emotion lines address to his wife and sons, full of love, concern

and tenderness. Convinced that "one should approach children as sensible beings with whom one can talk seriously about most serious things" (p 176), he makes a profound study of the interests of children, answers their questions, writes small stories for them and speaks with them about literature and writers, including Tolstoy, Chekhov and Gorkiy.

Although compiled of a great variety of materials, the book is a single integral work. The unique personality of its author--a consistent communist, who expresses thoughtfully and convincingly and defends his views and his profound interest in man and in the conditions, means and ways of shaping and developing the young generation and his passionate aspiration to see human society free of social inequality--seems to cement the entire text, ascribing to it a new quality, imbuing it with the bright light of communist idea-mindedness and historical optimism.

The annotation to the book points out that it is addressed to "scientific workers in education." Actually, this meets the spiritual need of a broad readership and would be useful to members of any profession one way or another interested in the problems of shaping the new man and in the all-round development of the individual.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) p 120

[Text] 1. "Vospominaniya o Vladimire Iliche Lenine" [Recollections About Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In five volumes. Volume 4. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Editorial Collegium: M. P. Mchedlov et al. Fourth volume prepared by M. G. Vlasova and K. G. Remizova. Third edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 477 pp.

2. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS 23 Oktyabrya 1984 Goda" [Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum of 23 October 1984]. A. I. Vol'skiy responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 64 pp.

3. Chernenko, K. U. "Vystupleniye na Vstreche s Rukovoditelyami Molodezhnykh Organizatsiy Sotsialisticheskikh Stran 5 Noyabrya 1984 Goda" [Speech at the Meeting With the Heads of Youth Organizations of Socialist Countries on 5 November 1984]. V. A. Pechenev and V. V. Pribytkov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 15 pp.

4. Chernenko, K. U. "Dostoyno Zavershit Pyatiletku, Uskorit' Intensifikatsiyu Ekonomiki" [Let Us Complete the Five-Year Plan Worthily and Accelerate Economic Intensification]. Speech at the 15 November 1984 CPSU Central Committee Politburo session. A. I. Vol'skiy responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 15 pp.

5. Gromyko, A. A. "Po Puti Oktyabrya--Kursom Sozidaniya i Mira" [On the Path of October--A Course of Building and Peace]. Report at the Ceremonious Session on the Occasion of the 67th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 6 November 1984. A. S. Chernyshev responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 32 pp.

6. Tikhonov, N. A. "Sovetskaya Ekonomika: Dostizheniya, Problemy, Perspektivy" [The Soviet Economy: Accomplishments, Problems, Prospects]. Izdatel'stvo APN, Moscow, 1984, 262 pp.

7. "Vizit v Sovetskiy Soyuz General'nogo Sekretarya TsK MNRP, Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov MNR Zhambyna Batmunkha 25-27 Oktyabrya 1984 Goda" [Visit to the Soviet Union of Jambyn Batmonh, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee General Secretary and Chairman of the Mongolian People's

Republic Council of Ministers, on 25-27 October 1984]. Documents and Materials. V. V. Sharapov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 32 pp with illustrations.

8. Belostetskaya, N. G. "Obshcheniye so Slushatelyami" [Communicating With the Audience]. How to learn from V. I. Lenin the method of a verbal address. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 192 pp.

9. "Delovoye Sotrudnichestvo v Interesakh Mira i Progressa" [Business Cooperation in the Interests of Peace and Progress]. By a collective of authors: Alkhimov, V. S., Brykin, V. A., Zhuravlev, G. K. and others. Edited and compiled by Brykin, V. A. and Chukanov, O. A. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 304 pp.

10. Nechkina, M. V. "Chitaya Marksa..." [As We Read Marx...]. A collection of works. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 150 pp.

11. "Problemy Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya" [Problems of the Communist Movement]. Karl Marx and Contemporary International Development. Yearbook, 1983. Yu. N. Pankov general editor. Mysl', Moscow, 1984, 303 pp.

12. "Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma" [Problems of Scientific Communism]. Issue No 18. "Some Problems of the Study of the Theoretical Legacy of Karl Marx. Topical Problems of CPSU Social Policy." Editorial Collegium: A. A. Amvrosov et al. Mysl', Moscow, 1984, 215 pp.

13. "Razmezhevaniya i Sdvigi v Sotsial-Reformizme" [Boundaries and Shifts in Social Reformism]. Critical study of leftist currents in Western European social democracy. A. S. Chernyayev and A. A. Galkin responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 341 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/06

INDEX OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS PUBLISHED IN KOMMUNIST IN 1984

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 84 (signed to press 17 Dec 84) pp 121-128

[Text]

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
New Document by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin	6	3	1
Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum	1	3	1
Text of Address by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary	1	4	3
On the Draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and Draft State Budget of the USSR for 1984	1	12	13
To the French 'Appeal of 100' Movement (Yu. V. Andropov)	2	3	1
Information Announcement on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum	3	3	1
N. A. Tikhonov's 13 February 1984 Speech at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum	3	5	3
K. U. Chernenko Speech at 13 February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum	3	7	6
M. S. Gorbachev's Address at the 13 February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum	3	14	14
CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers Appeal to the Communist Party and the Soviet People	3	15	15

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Speech by K. U. Chernenko at 14 February 1984 Funeral Meeting	3	17	18
Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee to All Voters and Citizens of the USSR	3	19	20
Speech by K. U. Chernenko at 2 March 1984 Meeting With Electorate	4	3	1
At the CPSU Central Committee	4	14	14
K. U. Chernenko Speech at 26 March 1984 All-Union Economic Conference on Problems of the Agroindustrial Complex	6	19	20
K. U. Chernenko's Address to a Delegation of the Municipality of the Italian City of Assisi and Representatives of the Franciscan Order, PRAVDA, 31 March 1984	6	20	22
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to the Appeal of Leading Figures of the Socialist International	6	21	24
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From the Newspaper PRAVDA	6	23	26
Information Report on the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee	6	27	30
Speech by K. U. Chernenko at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 10 April 1984	6	28	31
On Further Improving the Works of the Soviets of People's Deputies	6	36	41
Basic Directions of the Reform of General Education and Vocational Schools	6	37	43
Speech by M. S. Gorbachev	6	41	47
USSR Supreme Soviet Decree on Election of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	6	43	49
Speech by Deputy K. U. Chernenko on Election of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	6	46	53
Deputy K. U. Chernenko's Speech on Appointing the USSR Council of Ministers	6	47	55

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
K. U. Chernenko's 13 April Address to Presidium	6	49	56
To the Journal KOMMUNIST	7	3	1
K. U. Chernenko's 25 April 1984 Speech	7	4	3
K. U. Chernenko's 29 April 1984 Speech	7	9	9
In the Forefront of the Ideological Struggle	7	120	150
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to American Scientists' Appeal	8	14	13
Living, Working, Struggling in Leninist Fashion	9	3	1
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to Kelly	9	11	10
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From American Journalist J. Kingsbury-Smith	9	13	13
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From the Newspaper PRAVDA	9	15	15
K. U. Chernenko's Speech at the Reception in Honor of the Participants in the Economic Summit Conference of the CEMA Member Countries on 14 June 1984	9	18	19
On the Main Directions of Further Developing and Strengthening the Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation of CEMA Member Countries	9	20	22
Declaration of the Member Countries of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance: "Maintenance of Peace and International Economic Cooperation"	9	27	31
At the CPSU Central Committee	9	36	41
Improving Further Party Leadership of the Komsomol, Upgrading Its Role in Communist Upbringing of Youth..	11	3	1
Building an Atmosphere of Trust in the World.....	11	20	21
At the CPSU Central Committee	12	3	1

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to Appeal by Irish Public Figure	12	21	22
Strengthening Mutual Trust (K. U. Chernenko)	13	3	1
K. U. Chernenko Replies to Nuclear-Free Zone Forum	13	5	3
K. U. Chernenko Replies to PRAVDA's Questions	13	6	5
To Assert the Truth of Life, the Lofty Ideals of Socialism (K. U. Chernenko)	14	3	1
Let Us Know and Understand Each Other Well (K. U. Chernenko)	14	12	10
K. U. Chernenko's Address to Finnish TV Viewers	14	14	12
The People's Controllers' High Civic Duty (K. U. Chernenko)	15	13	13
Information Report on a CPSU Central Committee Plenum	16	3	1
Speech by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary K. U. Chernenko at the 23 October 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum	16	4	2
Central Committee Resolution on Land Utilization	16	12	12
At the CPSU Central Committee	16	17	18
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to the Questions of THE WASHINGTON POST	16	21	23
Complete the Five-Year Plan in a Fitting Manner, Speed Up the Intensification of the Economy (K. U. Chernenko)	17	3	1
K. U. Chernenko's Speech at the Meeting With Leaders of Socialist Youth Organizations of Socialist Countries	17	22	24
Address by K. U. Chernenko to U. S. Readers	17	25	28

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From M. Kalb, Correspondent of the American Television Company NBC	17	26	30
To the Participants in the All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on "The Perfection of Developed Socialism and the Party's Ideological Work in the Light of the Decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum (K. U. Chernenko)	18	22	24
Toward the 27th Party Congress			
Some Current Problems of CPSU Theory, Strategy and Tactics (K. U. Chernenko)	18	3	1
Editorials and Editorial Articles			
The World at a Responsible Crossroads	2	4	3
Not Only Obligation, But Also Patriotic Duty	5	3	1
More Alive Than All the Living	6	5	5
Topical Problems in the Analysis of Capitalism	8	3	1
The Socialist Social Climate	11	10	9
The People and the Party Are United	12	7	5
The Great October Revolution and the Revolutionary Renewal of the World	15	3	1
Communists and Problems of the Contemporary Period	15	89	99
Constant Attention and Support for the Brigades	17	12	12
With the Party, the People and the Country in Mind and Heart	17	70	82
Father of Scientific Communism			
Marx's Struggle Against Opportunism and for the Purity of Revolutionary Theory (A. Kosichev)	5	14	14

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Years of Marx and Ideological Struggle; Notes on Anniversary Conferences, Seminars and Symposia (M. Mchedlov)	10	42	45
The Way They Were (Nikolay Proshunin)	7	35	40
Karl Marx on the Individual's Conditions for His Liberation and Development (G. Smirnov)	13	34	39
Dispute on the Basics (T. Timofeyev)	13	23	26
Our Knowledge, Strength and Weapon			
Leninist Concept of Trade Unions Under Socialism and Ideological Struggle (G. Alekseyev)	1	39	44
Lenin on the Scientific Revolution (R. Aronov, L. Mikesheina)	8	29	31
Unity, Organization and Discipline (Y. Bugayev)	6	52	60
Meeting That Illuminated an Entire Life (Rodolfo Ghioldi, M. Tikhon)	6	64	74
Castles in the Air or Scientifically Substantiated Goal? (V. Golobokov)	14	15	14
Ideology of a Rising Class (R. I. Kosolapov, T. I. Oyzerman)	13	45	51
Leninist Approach to Analyzing Developments in Physics (I. Kikoin)	9	77	89
Taking Counsel With Lenin (O. Krivosheina)	12	22	24
The Torchbearer of the Revolutionary Era	1	29	32
We Are Going to Lenin (V. Chikin)	6	70	81

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Problems of Perfecting Developed Socialism			
Indicators of Socialist Management: An Economist's Outlook (D. Valovoy)	15	50	55
Responsibility in the System of Socialist Production Relations (B. Godunov)	5	24	25
The Nature of Contradictions in the Socialist Economy and the Forms of Their Solution (V. Kulikov)	9	42	48
Toward a Purely Social Mode of Production: Nature of the Leap and Stages of Stabilization	15	37	41
Development of the Theory and Practice of Planned Price Setting (A. Matlin)	5	36	39
Strengthening the Legal Base of Socialist Society (A. Sukharev)	9	65	75
The Real Democracy of Soviet Society (V. Shcherbitskiy)	17	29	33
Theory and Practice of Party Construction			
Ideologically Ensuring the Program of Socioeconomic Development of the Capital (V. Grishin)	2	16	16
Indissoluble Revolutionary Continuity of Generations (L. Zaykov)	17	44	50
Some Questions of Enhancing the People's Material Well-Being (I. Kapitonov)	10	29	30
The Party and the Komsomol at the Contemporary Stage and Development of Soviet Society (Yu. Ligachev)	13	9	9
Collective Thought, Close-Knit Action (V. Markov)	9	54	62

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Work Systematically and Strenuously (N. Slyun'kov)	18	37	42
With a High Decree of Exactingness (M. Solomentsev)	15	21	22
Shevardnadze Views Problems of Youth Education (E. Shevardnadze)	18	24	26
All-Party Cause			
Creative Force of the Leninist Friendship of the Peoples (K. Abdulov, S. Khamidov)	12	44	51
Lenin's Theory of Reflection and the Art of Socialist Realism (A. Oganov)	12	56	65
Think and Work in a New Way (K. Rutenberg)	4	18	19
Cultivating Class Sense and Political Vigilance (P. Sardachuk)	12	33	38
For Class Vigilance (Y. Sokolov)	4	27	29
Social Impact of the Press (S. Tsukasov)	7	47	54
Soviet Power--Absolute Power of the People			
Treating People With Kindness and Consideration (M. Bityutskiy)	3	32	36
Soviets and Educating the Working People (Kh. Bokov)	3	40	45
Enhancing the Effectiveness of Institutions and Forms of Socialist Democracy (A. Voss)	2	30	32
Flag Over the Rural Soviet (V. Kovalenko)	3	27	30

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Some Questions at the Work of the Soviets of People's Deputies at the Contemporary Stage (V. Kuznetsov)	1	15	16
Combining Legislation, Administration and Control (I. Polyakov)	2	41	45
On the Levels of the 11th Five-Year Plan			
Developed Specialism and the Formation of Contemporary Economic Thinking (A. Abalkin)	18	61	69
Factor of Decisive Significance (A. Bachurin)	6	81	94
We Are Keeping Our Word As Workers (V. Berezin)	5	63	70
Economic Mechanism for the Formulation and Implementation of Intensive Plans by Collectives (P. Bunich)	5	48	52
Key Reserves in the Management of the National Economy (T. Gvishiani)	4	37	42
Automatic Control System in a Rural Rayon (L. Giginayshvili, A. Kobaidze, Kh. Repp)	1	63	71
Equipment of the Agricultural Worker (P. Guzhvin)	1	51	57
Procurement Discipline (Yu. Demin)	13	58	65
Shortandy Theater of Operations (A. Tikhtyar')	4	59	70
On Combining Branch and Territorial Management (V. Ikonnikov, S. Krylov)	4	48	56
Warmth of the Cold Taymyr (V. Kadulin)	7	68	79
Man at His Workplace (Yu. Konishchev)	8	41	45

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Material and Technical Foundation of the Agroindustrial Complex (Yu. Konkin)	18	49	56
Increasing Role of Workers in Developing Production and Management: Statements by Leningrad Brigade Leaders	5	60	66
National Labor Potential: How To Use It More Effectively (L. Kunel'skiy)	14	27	28
Increasing the Efficiency of the Brigade Contract (P. Lomako)	8	53	59
Industry and Trade: The Partnership Must Be Equal (Ya. Orlov)	11	49	55
Economy of Labor Tools (D. Palterovich)	10	53	59
Half-Faced to the Region (K. Pankova)	13	68	77
Innovations in Management and Economic Experimentation (A. Prigozhin)	7	57	65
Labor Collective and Trade Unions (V. Prokhorov)	10	65	72
Developing the Domestic Export Potential (N. Smelyakov)	14	39	41
Brigade Leaders Hold a Working Position (L. Cherepenin)	5	66	73
Orientation to Quality--A Long-Range Course of Economic Development (V. Chernyavskiy)	11	38	42
On the Future of Our School			
Way to the Unity of General Education and Vocational Training Schools (Yu. Borisov)	4	69	82

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Continuous Education System--Condition and Prospects (A. Vladislavlev)	2	54	61
School Reform: Problems of Pedagogical Theory (Ye. Gassel', N. Pakhomov and V. Severtsev) ..	4	75	89
A Matter Affecting the Interests of the Entire People	4	79	96
Complying With the Leninist Principles of Developing the People's Education (M. Zimyanin)	7	18	20
Aesthetic Attitude to Reality and the Individual (A. Melik-Pashayev)	3	67	80
Classes Must Be More Effective (M. Nechkina)	2	50	55
Upbringing in School (A. Kharchev)	3	46	52
Views on the Draft Education Reform (D. El'konin)	3	58	66
Science, Culture, Life			
An Effective Means of Educating the Soviet People	11	23	25
Topical Problems of International Cultural Exchanges at the Contemporary Stage (P. Demichev)	10	16	16
Historical Fate of Social Antagonisms (Yu. Zhdanov)	1	75	85
Never-Ending Source of Inspiration (Kaarel Ird)	1	89	100
Setting Sights on the Future (M. Koz'min)	13	78	88
Gen'us of Russian Culture (V. Kukharskiy)	8	65	74
Command of the Times (L. Lavlinskiy)	2	75	85

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
"...There Will Be a Garden City Here!" (P. Lapin)	16	38	43
Concrete Historicism vs. Abstract Anthropologism (V. Malinin)	2	65	74
How Is the Initiative Backed? (D. Mamleyev)	2	89	103
Vitally Important Aspects of the Marxist Concept of Abstract Labor (A. Melent'yev)	17	57	66
Scientific Historicism and the Cooperation of the Arts (Vladimir Terent'yevich Pashuto)	5	82	94
Place in the Life of the People (D. Pisarevskiy)	16	49	55
Modern Geology--A Science of New Tasks and Opportunities (A. Yanshin, L. Golovanov)	11	60	68
Pages From the Struggle			
Exploit Continued (V. Barayev)	5	70	78
"Free People's General" (K. Kurin)	10	97	110
Lenin's Swiss Friend (A. Latyshev)	6	103	122
KOMMUNIST--Direct Predecessor of BOL'SHEVIK	6	92	106
For Our Soviet Homeland			
Year Before the Victory (V. Arkhipenko)	7	81	95
Legendary Epic of Courage and Heroism (L. Zaykov)	2	101	117
Remembering the Lessons of Tankograd (I. Zal'tsman, G. Edel'gauz)	16	76	90

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
New Patriotic War Documents	16	60	68
Common Sense Imperative (Ivan Paderin)	10	77	85
Guarding the Peaceful Work of the Soviet People (V. Petrov)	3	79	94
Fiery Fighters for Communism			
He Was a Man! (M. Galla)	4	90	115
"I Believe in the Triumph of the Truth" (A. Zholkver)	11	72	83
A Communist and Ardent Patriot of the Socialist Motherland: On the 70th Anniversary of Yu. V. Andropov's Birth	9	87	101
Pioneer of the Japanese Communist Movement (A. Senatorov)	17	82	97
Stalwart Soldier of Lenin's Guard (M. Smirnov)	14	49	52
Neruda Was, Is and Will Be (Volodia Teitelboim)	9	97	112
Answer to a Letter From a Fellow Inmate (Ernst Thalmann)	17	91	107
Fighter's Last Words (Sula Theodoridi-Theodosiadi)	11	75	89
From the Experience of the Socialist Community			
Toward Socialism, Bypassing Capitalist Slavery (Jambyn Batmonh)	16	88	104
Inexhaustible Source (Doychin Doychinov)	8	74	85
CEMA Power Supply (A. Zubkov)	12	75	91
Economic Intensification--Strategic Task of the CzCP (V. Kadulin)	12	67	78

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
KOMMUNIST on USSR-GDR Economic Cooperation (L. Kostandov)	14	68	74
Laws Must Be Followed Unswervingly and Economic Management Updated (Le Duan)	15	62	69
Poland: Forty Years Along the Road to Socialism (Tadeusz Porembski)	10	89	101
The Basis for Strengthening the Community of CEMA Countries (N. Tikhonov)	10	3	1
Certain Problems of the Ideological Struggle and the Shaping of a New Culture in Vietnam (Ha Xuan Truong)	8	81	93
Our Republic Is a State of Peace and Socialism (Erich Honecker)	14	59	64
Under the Banner of Internationalism			
Ideological Tasks of West German Communists in the Struggle for Peace and Labor (Willi Gerns)	16	104	122
Russians in the First International (R. Konyushaya)	15	77	85
Communists and the New Social Protest Movements (Yu. Krasin)	5	105	121
Major Stage of the Ethiopian Revolution (Haile Mariam Mengistu)	13	89	102
Object Lesson of Revolutionary Endeavor (V. Mushinskiy)	8	92	106
From Liberation to Socialist Renaissance: Revolutions of the Forties in Eastern Europe (I. Orlik)	18	72	82
Concrete Actions for the Sake of Strengthening Peace (B. Ponomarev)	8	16	15

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Revolutionary Transformations in the World and Their Causes (B. Ponomarev)	16	24	26
In Alliance With the Victorious Proletariat (Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal)	3	89	106
World Revolutionary Process: Pressing Issues (Karl-Heinz Schroeder)	4	102	128
Realities of the Contemporary Epoch			
Propaganda Myths and Hard Facts (Vl. Afanas'yev, R. Dzarasov)	14	90	100
The Liberated Countries at the Beginning of the 1980s (K. Brutents)	3	102	121
America Is Not the United States Only (V. Bushuyev, B. Martynov)	9	114	132
Dead Ends of Dependent Development (A. Vasil'yev)	11	87	104
System of Violence and Wars; The United States Through the Eyes of an American Journalist	1	103	118
Strengthening Peace and Security in Asia (Mangalyn Dugersuren)	11	77	92
May the French-Soviet Friendship Continue To Be Strengthened (Jacques Duclos)	15	103	116
Departures and Blind Alleys of Bourgeois Political Economy (N. Yermoshkin)	5	116	134
Act of Imperial Ignorance (N. Ivanov)	2	120	139
Intervention Syndrome and Lessons of History (V. Mal'kov, B. Marushkin)	1	96	108
Communists and Believers (N. Koval'skiy)	13	99	114

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Nuclear Responsibility Code (V. Korionov)	10	106	121
World War I: Lessons in History (I. Krivoguz)	11	96	114
Who Destroyed Trust and When? On the Subject of an Unknown Letter by Niels Bohr) (V. Mal'kov)	17	106	131
Cuba--A Free Territory in America	2	112	131
Structural Crisis and Sociopolitical Polarization in the Capitalist World (V. Kuvaldin)	14	77	85
Multinational Corporations and the Philippines (Merlin M. Magallona)	15	108	123
Structural Crisis of the Capitalist Economy (S. Men'shikov)	4	112	139
Hypocrisy Is an Intrinsic Part of Imperialism's Foreign Policy: Lessons of History (I. Mints)	12	99	120
Detente: Origins and Potentialities (Yu. Molchanov)	13	109	126
Year 1984. The Most Important Trends in International Developments (Yu. Molchanov, V. Nekrasov)	18	96	110
Attention: Revanchism! (V. Nekrasov)	9	126	146
"War Alarm" in Central America (V. Nekrasov)	17	109	136
KOMMUNIST on Peace Movement in West, East (V. Orel)	12	87	105
Outer Space Is No Place for Military Adventures (M. Rebrov)	9	108	125
Elections and Politics (Andrew Rothstein)	1	113	129

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Cheap Show (Melor Sturua)	1	118	135
Who Is Preventing Peace in Africa? (Ye. Tarabrin)	18	84	96
Women in the Struggle for Peace, Equal Rights and Social Progress (V. Tereshkova)	8	104	120
U. S. Intrigues on the Korean Peninsula (V. Tikhomirov)	10	116	132
Equal Negotiations and Not Military Antagonism (L. Tolkunov)	7	93	109
Yesterday in Today's Washington (V. Falin)	8	114	131
Soviet Trade Unions in the Struggle for Peace (S. Shalayev)	5	93	107
From the Editorial Mail			
Respect, Attention and Concern for Retirees (N. Gordeyev)	12	111	134
Transportation for Siberia (S. Yeger)	10	118	136
Secondary Metal Service (L. Zhizmor)	3	114	137
We Try To Act Responsibly (O. Ignatenko)	3	117	142
Workplace System: Development Features (I. Malmygin)	5	122	144
Following KOMMUNIST Publications (V. Yelyutin)	6	127	159
Following a KOMMUNIST Article (V. Trukhanovskiy)	17	127	170
Journal's Mail: July-December 1983	2	122	143

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Journal's Mail: January-June 1984	11	122	152
On Sensible Consumption Standards (K. Fedorov)	12	114	140
Honor and Glory According to Labor (Yu. Shcherbakov)	17	111	140
Critique and Bibliography			
Aganbekyan, A.--Economics of Developed Socialism ("Sovetskaya Ekonomika: Dostizheniya, Problemy, Perspektivy" [The Soviet Economy: Achievements, Problems, Prospects] by N. A. Tikhonov)	7	109	131
Anchishkin, A.--Scientific Analysis of the World Socialist Economy ("Mirivoye Sotsialisticheskoye Khozyaystvo: Voprosy Politicheskoy Ekonomiki" [The World Socialist Economy: Problems of Political Economy], O. T. Bogomolov, ed.)	3	126	157
Arkhipenko, V.--Scorching Lines ("Pis'ma Slavy i Bessmertiya" [Letters of Glory and Immortality])	1	124	128
Arkhipov, B.--Contemporary of the Future ("Deloto na Georgi Dimitrov i Nashata Suvremennost" [Georgi Dimitrov's Cause and Our Contemporaneity] ...	12	120	151
Badya, L.--Working Class Historian ("Rabochiy Klass Rossii" [The Russian Working Class], by A. M. Pankratova)	17	123	162
Borodin, L.--Book by a Fighter ("Klassovaya Bor'ba i Natsional'nyy Vopros" [The Class Struggle and the National Problem] by Michael O'Riordan)	8	126	146
Bugayev, Ye.--Strange Position	14	119	145
Buganov, V.--Major Patriotic Publication ("Soyuz Nerushimyy. Vek XX" [Indissoluble Union. The Twentieth Century]; "Za Zemlyu Russkuyu. Vek XIII" [For the Russian Land. The Thirteenth Century]; "Stoyati Zaodno. Vek XVII" [Standing Together. The Seventeenth Century]; "Sedoy Ural. Vek XVIII" [Hoary Ural. The Eighteenth Century]; "Gornyye Vetry. Konets XIX-Nachalo XX v." [Mountain Winds. End of the Nineteenth and Beginning of the Twentieth Century]; "Obnovleniye Zemli. Vek XX"			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
[Renovation of the Land. The Twentieth Century], all published in the series "History of Our Fatherland in Novels, Stories, and Documents")	12	117	145
Important Contribution to the Study of the World Historical Press ("Vsemirnaya Istoriya" [History of the World])	18	111	135
Vid, R.--Duty to the Party and the People ("V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Rabote s Pis'mami Trudyashchikhsya" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on Work With Letters From Working People], ed. by B. P. Yakovlev, compiled by B. K. Alekseyev and M. N. Perfil'yev)	6	123	152
Vishnevskiy, A.--Art in the Capitalist World: The Struggle of Ideas ("Sovremennoye Zapadnoye Iskusstvo. Bor'ba Idey" [Contemporary Western Art. Struggle of Ideas] by L. Ya. Reyngardt)	7	116	143
Leading the Creativity of the Masses ("Problems of Party-Organizational and Ideological Work," by V. V. Grishin)	13	121	140
Golovanov, L.--Book on the Russian Translator of "Das Kapital," Marx's Friend ("Pervyy Russkiy Perevodchik 'Kapitala'" [The First Russian Translator of "Das Kapital"] by O. A. Saykin)	17	116	149
Grechishnikov, P.--Socialist Competition and Rivalry ("Sorevnovaniye i Konkurentsia. Kritika Antimarksistskikh Vzgl'yadkov" [Competition and Rivalry. Critique of Anti-Marxist Views])	11	118	145
Drobizhev, V.--Today's Working Class ("K Izucheniyu Rabochego Klassa i Rabochego Dvizheniya" [Study of the Working Class and the Worker Movement], ed. by T. T. Timofeyev, M. A. Zaborov, L. B. Moskvina, Yu. R. Skvirskiy; "Razvitiye Rabochego Klassa v Sotsialisticheskoy Obshchestve" [Development of the Working Class in the Socialist Society], ed. by T. T. Timofeyev, L. A. Gordon and E. V. Klopov; "Kommunisty i Trudyashchiyesya Krupnykh Gorodov v Bor'be za Sotsial'nyy i Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Progress" [Communists and Working People in the Large Cities in the Struggle for Social and Scientific and Technical Progress], ed. by V. A. Bogorad, E. V. Klopov, and A. K. Nazimova)	3	120	146

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Yegorov, A.--Leninism--The Great Science of Winning ("Pod Znamenem Leninizma" [Under the Banner of Leninism], by M. V. Zimyanin)	16	114	133
Zhuravlev, V.--Following Lenin's Addresses ("Lenin v Peterburge-Petrograde: Mesta Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti v Gorode i Okrestnostyakh. 1890-1920" [Lenin in Petersburg-Petrograd: Sites of Life and Activities in the City and Its Suburbs. 1890-1920], by T. P. Bondarevskaya, A. Ya. Velikanova and F. M. Suslova. Second expanded edition; "Leninyana: Poist. Istochnikovedeniye. Arkheografiya" [Leninyana: Research, Source Studies, Archaeography]; "V. I. Lenin i Piderskiye Rabochiye" [V. I. Lenin and the Workers of Peter]; "Po Leninskim Adresam" [Following Lenin's Addresses], by T. P. Bondarevskaya, A. Ya. Velikanova, and F. M. Suslova)	6	114	136
Kirshin, Yu.--Imperialist Psychological Warfare ("Psikhologicheskaya Voyna. Podryvnyye Deystviya Imperializma v Oblasti Obshchestvennogo Soznaniya" [Psychological Warfare. Subversive Imperialist Activities in the Area of Social Consciousness], by D. A. Volkogonov)	14	126	158
Kiselev, V.--In the United Battle Ranks ("Kogda Gremeli Bol..." [When the Battles Thundered....], by I. M. Podobed and B. G. Komskiy)	3	124	153
Kuz'menko, V.--Aspects, Discussions, Criticism and Self-Criticism in the Social Sciences; Marginal Notes	11	111	133
Kuz'menko, V.--"...The Revolution Needs This" ("Jaroslav Hasek--Zhurnalists" [Jaroslav Hasek-- Journalist], by Zdenek Gorzeni; "Primery iz Zhizni" [Examples From Life], by Jaroslav Hasek)	17	125	166
Kulikov, A. Pokrytan--On the History of the Creation of the Main Marxist Work ("Ocherki po Istorii 'Kapitala' K. Marksa" [Essays on the History of K. Marx's "Das Kapital"], V. S. Vygodskiy et al., editors)	18	108	149
Markov, V.--Ideal and Life ("Sotsialisticheskii Ideal i Real'nyi Sotsializm" [Socialist Ideal and Real Communism] by V. A. Pechenev)	7	114	139

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Mitin, M.--Aid to Sociologists ("Rabochaya Kniga Sotsiologa" [The Sociologist's Work Book], second revised and enlarged edition)	14	117	142
Morgun, F.--Farmer's Wise Word ("Dumy ob Urozhaye" [Thoughts About Crops], by T. S. Mal'tsev)	10	125	140
Novopashin, Yu.--When the Secret Becomes Obvious ("Krakh 'Operatsii Poloniya.' 1980-1981 Gg." [The Failure of "Operation Polonia," 1980-1981], by V. P. Trubnikov)	15	125	147
Petrov, V.--A Great Love of the People ("Vystrel v Serdtse Revolyutsii" [Shot in the Heart of the Revolution])	11	109	129
Petrovskiy, V.--International Conflicts and Universal Security in the Nuclear Century ("Mezhdunarodnyye Konflikty Sovremennosti" [Contemporary International Conflicts], V. I. Gantman, responsible editor; "Atlanticheskiye Soyuzniki: Novyye Tendentsii v Sopernichestve" [The Atlantic Allies: New Rivalry Trends], by G. A. Vorontsov and A. I. Utkin; "Mezhdunarodnaya Bezopasnost' i Global'nyye Problemy" [International Security and Global Problems], by Yu. Ye. Fedorov)	18	115	142
Pokrovskiy, N.--U.S. Intelligentsia: History and Contemporaneity ("Amerikanskiy Kapitalizm i Intelligentsiya" [American Capitalism and Intelligentsia], by V. B. Kuvaldin)	5	126	151
Rukavitsyn, M.--Artistic Image and Knowledge of Reality ("Gorizonty Khudozhestvennogo Obraza" [Horizons of the Artistic Image], by M. B. Krapchenko)	15	118	134
Sedykh, V.--Marx's Comrade-in-Arms ("Russkaya Soratnitsa Marksa" [Marx's Russian Comrade-in-Arms], by N. Yefremov and N. Ivanov)	4	125	154
Sibiryakov, N.--Art and Myths of the Bourgeois World ("V Ritme Vremeni" [In Rhythm With the Times], by V. Baskakov; "Chelovek i Mif" [The Person and the Myth], by G. Kapralov; "Mif o Smerti Iskusstva" [The Myth of the Death of Art], by V. Arslanov)	16	122	146

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Slavin, B.--Marxism's Revolutionary Method (O Metode Izlozheniya Dialektiki" [On the Method for the Presentation of Dialectics], by B. M. Kedrov)	7	105	124
Smirnov, G.--Self-Awareness of Science ("Filosofiya i Nauchnoye Poznaniye" [Philosophy and Scientific Knowledge], by P. N. Fedoseyev)	14	105	120
Tikhvinskiy, S.--History and Lessons of World War II ("Vtoraya Mirovaya Voyna. Kratkaya Istoriya" [World War II. A Short History], International Editorial Collegium: P. A. Zhilin and Ye. M. Zhukov, chairmen (USSR); D. Sirkov (Bulgaria); E. Liptai (Hungary); W. Schuman (GDR); Sh. Natsagdorzh (Mongolia); R. Dzipanov (Poland); M. Fetu (Romania); V. Pesa (Czechoslovakia)	15	120	138
Fedorin A.--Report on the Road of the Genius of the Revolution	6	118	144
Kharchev, A.--Dialectics and Logic of Historical Materialism ("Istoricheskiy Materializm. Problemy Metodologii" [Historical Materialism. Problems of Methodology], by L. F. Il'ichev)	14	110	129
Cherkovets, V.--Perfecting Socialist Economic Management: Theory, Practice, Problems ("Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskim Proizvostvom: Problemy, Teorii i Praktiki" [Socialist Production Management: Problems of Theory and Practice], by V. A. Medvedev)	17	118	154
Shemyatenkov, V.--For the Foreign Reader ("Kratkiy Kurs Politicheskoy Ekonomii" [Short Course in Political Economy], by L. Abalkin, S. Dzarasov and A. Kulikov)	10	126	151
Yakovlev, A.--Loyalty to the Leninist Banner ("Leniniskim Kursom Mira" [The Leninist Peace Course], by A. A. Gromyko)	14	99	110
Short Book Reviews	1, 7, 10, 11, 18		

Bookshelf 1, 4, 8, 9, 12, 14,
15, 16, 18

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/6

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

12 APRIL 85